THE Covenant Sealed OR, A TREATISE OF THE SACRAMENTS of both COVENANTS, *POLEMICALL* and *PRACTICALL*. ESPECIALLY Of the *Sacraments* of the *Covenant of Grace*.

IN WHICH,

The *nature of them* is laid open,
The *adaequate subject* is largely inquired into,
respective { to *right* and *proper interest*. / to *fitnesse for admission to actual participation*.
Their *necessity* is made known.
Their *whole Use* and *Efficacy* is set forth.
Their *number* in *Old* and *New Testament-times* is determined.
With several necessary and useful *Corollaries*.

Together with a brief Answer to Reverend Mr. *Baxter's* Apology, in defence of the *Treatise of the Covenant*.

By *Thomas Blake*, M. A. Pastor of *Tamworth* in the Counties of *Stafford* and *Warwick*.

Davenant. de morte Christi, pag. 1.

Neque tam pugnam meditor, aut dimicationem; quam planam & pacatam totius rei explicationem, ad conflictum cum nullo hoste venturus, nisi ita se nobis obviam dederit; ut non possumus aliter, quam pugnando, viam ad veritatem aperire.

London, Printed for *Abel Roper*, at the Sun against S *Dunstans* Church in *Fleet-street*, 1655. July 7

THE

OR A

TREATISE

OF THE

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

To the Right Worshipfull,

Sir *FRANCIS NETHERSOLE*

of *Nethersole* in the County of *Kent*, Knight.

THe great engagements in which I stand by many favours received, to much Honoured friends of yours, put me on, to send forth a former Treatise into publick view under their names. This being of so near affinity, I thought it meet that it should come abroad under the Patronage of one of so near alliance. I need not mention my particular engagements, which you do not desire I know to hear. Since the time, that after your great imployments both at home and abroad, in affaires of State, God hath been pleased to seat you in these parts; your singular candour towards all those that labour in the Work, to which through grace I am called, is eminently seen. You were tenderly conscientious, without great caution put, to adventure on the purchase of a Mannor to which an Impropriation was annext, which yet for many reasons you could not without great inconvenience avoid. And notwithstanding a Vicarage there endowed, which others (though not you) would have judged a competency, your great care was as soon as you were fully possessed, finding an Incumbent there, whom you had no reason to encourage, nor power to remove, to superinduce others, one after other, in a more happy, and edifying way; to carry on that work. It was no sooner void, but you took care to settle one of eminent gifts and graces, with that liberal munificence, that a free School for poor children, built at your proper cost, being provided for, little remains yours, of that part of your purchase. Your sollicitous care is still, no lesse (whereof there are many knowing witnesses) how to settle it with all possible speed upon posterity, in such a way, that God

23

may be most honoured, and piety advanced by it. Which also (as I have heard from your own mouth) your much honoured and pious Lady deceased, did often perswade to hasten; although she well knew, that out of your love to her, you had by your last Will and Testament devised to her, that whole Lordship of Polesworth (to a fourth part whereof she was heir) and all the rest of your Estate in these parts, for an increase of her Joynture. If the Lord Christ tells us, that the cost which that Pious woman spent on him, should be told for a memorial of her, wheresoever in the world the Gospel should be preacht; I suppose that this which you have done, may be mentioned for your honour, with hers, that rests in the Lord: wheresoever this small piece by Providence shall come to be read. I may well look upon you, as one of the most acute of my Readers: If therefore this may gain your favour, I shall have lesse cause to fear others censure; Though in so great variety of things, as are here toucht upon, and so much controversal, I cannot expect that any one should subscribe to every piece. The whole may be serviceable, though some part remain under dispute. As it fares with me in reading the Labours of many others, so I may well expect that it will be with others, in reading any thing of mine. Your great zeal, as to the whole of the worship of God, so to this part here treated of, where you are known, cannot be hid. Your complaint hath often been, of the sad neglect of the Lords Supper; and it lyes as a sad burden on the spirits of many eminently Pious servants of Jesus Christ, that they see not a door opened for their comfortable, and orderly administration and participation of it. If any thing be here said to give any further light in these sacred mysteries, and to facilitate the way of administration to pious dispensers, so, as the honour of the Ordinance may be preserved, and the edification of soules promoted, I have that which I desire, and have made my endeavour. The Lord honour your hoare hairs with everlasting dayes, and give you the comfort of all that you have done, in, and for his Name: Sir, I am

From my Study in *Tamworth*, Jun. 5. 1655.

Your Servant in any Christian Office,

Thomas Blake.

Worthy Reader;

THe holy Scripture puts an eminent character, *Acts* 18. 24, 25, &c. upon *Apollos*, then but an alphabetarian in the Gospel-doctrine, *That he was an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures* of the Old Testament. And if I would cut by this pattern, and that either the Reverend Author, whose learned Works have already spoken him to the Church: Or this Judicious Treatise which now fitly followes its elder brother under the name of the *Covenant sealed*, stood in need of an Epistle Commendatory, I should not be ashamed, both to testifie my honour of the man, and my valuation of his Work; and yet neither I, nor any other man in this case ought to be interpreted, as ὑπερασπιστὴς, a propugnatour of every opinion in the book by him commended to the Presse; no more than the Midwife is accountable for every imperfection of the child by her brought forth to light.

I confesse I had the liberty and honour afforded me to peruse this Treatise before it saw the Presse; but my indisposition of body prohibited me of making a full survey: onely my greedy eye led me so far as that I could make observation of two things: 1. The predominant

nant ſcope of the Authour in this work. 2. The purſuance thereof as to the main. The ſcope is rare, *viz.* An Eſſay to find a way of regular admiſſion unto, and holy adminiſtration of the Lords Supper, between thoſe extreams of promiſcuous intruſion on the one hand, and the total forbearance of it on the other, both which do afflict the ſpirits of the godly that are caſt into broken Congregations all the Land over without Card or Compaſſe to ſteer by to their comfort; and ſo it is very likely to be a *word ſpoken upon his wheeles* to many Miniſters, who may find here a thred to direct them out of thoſe labyrinths and perplexities out of which they find it hard to extricate themſelves.

And then in purſuance of this main ſcope, and indeed in all the parts of the Treatiſe that I have read: Scriptures are balanced and pondered ſo Judiciouſly, and there is ſo much demonſtration of acuteneſſe of judgement, ſolidity of reaſon, ſweetneſſe and candour of ſpirit, that if thou in reading diſlodge prejudice, and hold the ſcale even, I hope thou ſhalt not write upon thy pains, *Labour in vain. Vale, fruere.*

Laurence-Jury, London, *June* 12. 1655.

Thine in the Lord,

Ri. Vines.

The

The PREFACE.

GOds *Covenant is the ground of all our comfort; it is (as I may call it) the Grand Charter, by which all our Christian rights and priviledges are conveyed unto us.* Then (*saith the Lord*) will I remember my Covenant with Jacob, and also my Covenant with Isaac, and also my Covenant with Abraham will I remember, and I will remember the Land, *Levit.* 26. 41. Remember, break not thy Covenant with us, *say the people of God unto him*, Jer. 14. 21. O Israel, fear not, *saith he; why?* Thou art mine, *Isai.* 43. 1. *How?* I entred into Covenant with thee, and thou becamest mine, *Ezek.* 16. 8. I am thine, save me, *saith* David *unto him*, Psal. 119. 94. *building his confidence upon this, that he was in Covenant with God, and was his by Covenant.* I am the Lord thy God, *saith he*, viz. * *by Covenant; what then?* Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it, *Psal.* 81. 10. *As if he should say, Seeing thou hast such Covenant-interest in me, enlarge thy desires as much as thou canst, and I will satisfie them.* *As Christ said to his Disciples*, If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ask what you will, and it shall be done unto you, *Joh.* 15. 7. *Hereupon* Jehoshaphat *pleaded with God in his distresse, saying*, Art not thou, our God? 2 *Chron.* 20. 7. O our God, wilt not thou judge them? for we have no might against this great multitude, neither know we what to do, but our eyes are upon thee, *verse* 12. *So likewise* Asa cryed unto the Lord his God, *saying*, Help us, O Lord our God, *&c.* 2 Chron. 14. 11. *This was the ground of the everlasting happinesse of* Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob, *that God was in Covenant with them, and was their God by Covenant. Thence Christ inferred, that they were not so dead, but that their soules did still live, and that their bodies also at last should be raised up, and both soules and bodies live for ever*, Matth. 22. 32. *Gods Covenant*

* Gen. 17. 7. Jer. 31. 33.

venant is an everlasting Covenant, ordered in all things, and sure, 2 *Sam.* 23. 5. *He is a God* that keepeth Covenant, *Neh.* 1. 5. He will ever be mindful of his Covenant, *Psal.* 111. 5. *He is* Elohe, *Amen*, the God of truth, *Isai.* 65. 16. ἀψευδὴς, God that cannot lie, *Tit.* 1. 2. *He hath given his Son to be* a Medaitour of the new Covenant, *Heb.* 12. 24. In him all the Promises are Yea, and in him Amen, 2 *Cor.* 1. 20. *And to confirm the Covenant the more unto us, God hath so condescended to our weaknesse, as to vouchsafe us not onely his Word, but also his Sacraments, as signes and seales of his Covenant. The word* Sacrament *Christians have borrowed from Heathens.* Plinie *the younger, a heathen Author, useth the word with reference unto Christians, yet with no respect (I suppose) to either of the Sacraments, but onely according to the usual (though here metaphorical) acception of the word among the heathens. He saith, That Christians assembling together did use to bind themselves by Sacrament, (or oath, did solemnly and religiously bind themselves, as Souldiers were wont to bind themselves to their General) not to any wickednesse, but against the committing of any theft, or robbery, or adultery, &c.* Tertullian *doth frequently use the word, but whether at any time in that strict notion, as it is now used, I cannot easily say. Sometimes he useth it in allusion to that Military oath which the Heathens called* Sacramentum. Do we think (*saith he*) that after a divine Sacrament it is lawful to superinduce one that is humane, and after Christ to acknowledge another Lord? *And again,* The Communication of peace, and the appellation of brotherhood, and the contesseration of hospitality, are rights, which no other reason doth rule, but the tradition of the same Sacrament. *Upon which place* Pamelius *saith, that* Macereus *did rightly render* Sacramentum *an oath; for that* Tertullian *did allude to the oath, (the solemn obligation he meaneth) by which as by a military Sacrament (or oath) we bind our selves in Baptisme. Sometimes by* Sacrament *in* Tertullian *is meant Faith, or Doctrine, as when he saith of Heresies, that they are* no way Apostolical, because of the diversity of the Sacrament; *that is, as* Pamelius *doth well expound*

Seq; Sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, &c. *Plin.* Epist. 97. ad Trajan.

Credimúsne humanum Sacramentum Divino superinduci licere et in alium Dominum respondere post Christum? *Tert.* de Cor. Mil. cap. 11. Communicatio pacis, et appellatio fraternitatis, et contesseratio hospitalitatis; quæ jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejusdem Sacramenti traditio. De Præscr. c. 20.

Rectè hic *Macereus* Sacramentum vertit Gallicè juramentum. Alludit enim ad jusjurandum, quo tanquam Sacramento militari in Baptismo nos obstringimus. *Pamel.* in Annot.

Nullo modo Apostolicæ ob diversitatem Sacramenti, De Præscript. cap. 22.

pound it, the diversity of Faith: for otherwise Heretics may have the same Sacraments with the Catholiques. Sometimes Tertullian speaking of Sacraments, doth instance indeed in Baptisme and the Lords Supper; but so also in divers other things, some whereof the Romanists themselves do not reckon among Sacraments, as Virginity and continency, which Pamelius takes no notice of, when he pretends to find all their seven Sacraments, except Extream Unction, there asserted by Tertullian. An ancient Bishop, though after Tertullian, viz. Firmilianus, in an Epistle to Cyprian doth sometimes mention the Sacrament of Baptisme; but whether he doth take the word strictly, or largely, may be a question, because in the same Epistle he speaketh of many Sacraments, and nameth the Celebration of Easter as one of them. That Treatise de Cardinalibus Christi Operibus, one part whereof is de Baptismo Christi, wherein Baptisme is called a Sacrament, that Treatise is found to be none of Cyprians: and though Pamelius and Bellarmine suppose that the Author was ancient, and of the same time with Cyprian, because the title speaks it as if it had been directed to Cornelius, who was Bishop of Rome in Cyprian's time, yet B. Usher observes, that in old Manuscripts, Arnoldus Carnotensis Abbas Bonevallis, who was many hundred years after Cyprian, viz. in the year 1160. is mentioned as the Authour. Hilarie about 100 years after Cyprian, speaks of the Sacrament of Christs body and blood. Ambrose about the same time with Hilary, or but a little after, hath written six Books De Sacramentis; and, which is observable, he treateth therein onely of Baptisme, and the Lords Supper. Austine writing not much after Ambrose, (by whom he came to the knowledge of the truth) often useth the word, and that in the most strict acception. The Word (saith he) being added to the Element, there is made a Sacrament; which is also it self as it were a visible Word. And again, What else are all corporal Sacraments, but as it were certain visible words? And having said, that Christ did institute Sacraments, in number very few, for

Ipsas quoque res Sacramentorum Divinorum in idolorum mysteriis emulatur, nempe Diabolus. Tingit et ipse, &c. ——Habet et Virgines, habet et Continentes. *De Prescript.* cap. 40.

Nulla quippe differentia est inter Pseudoprophetam, & Hæreticum. Nam ut ille in nomine Dei, aut Christi, ita iste in Sacramento Baptismi fallit. Epist. 76. *inter Epistolas Cypriani.* Circa celebrandos dies Paschæ, & circa multa alia divinæ rei Sacramenta, &c. *Ibid.*

Pamel. in Annotat. *Vellæ.* de Scriptor.

B. *Usher* in the Catalogue of Authours cited in his Answer to the Jesuites Challenge.

Quàm autem in eo per Sacramentum communicare carnis & sanguinis simus, &c. *Hilar.* de Trin. lib. 8.

Accedit verbum ad elementum, & fit Sacramentum, etiam ipsum tanquam visibile verbum, *Aug.* in Joh. Tract. 80.

Quid sunt aliud quæque corporalia Sacramenta, nisi quædam quasi verba visibilia? *Contra Faust.* l. 19. c. 16.

observa-

Christus Sacramentis numero pauciſſimis, obſervatione facillimis, ſignificatione præſtantiſſimis, ſocietatem novi populi colligavit, ſicut eſt Baptiſmus, et Communicatio corporis et ſanguinis ipſius, etſi quid aliud in Scripturis Canonicis commendatur. *Epiſt. ad Jan.* 118. *cap.* 1.

obſervation very eaſie, and for ſignification moſt excellent, he expreſly ſaith, that theſe Sacraments are Baptiſme and the Lords Supper; adding indeed, and if there be any other commended in the Canonical Scriptures. *But that there is any other Sacrament beſides Baptiſme and the Lords Supper, commended in the Scripture, he doth not affirm. Yea, in another place having uſed the like words concerning the Sacraments of the New Teſtament he mentioneth theſe two onely, leaving no ſuſpition at all, as if there were any other. Beſides, when he affirmeth the Sacraments to be as it were viſible words, (as in the places before cited) he plainly enough excludeth thoſe Popiſh Sacraments, Penance and Matrimony.* Bellarmine *would have it ſuffice, if the outward ſign be any way ſenſible, though it be perceived onely by the ſenſe of Hearing. But* (*as* Chamier *well obſerves*) Auſtine *needed not to have mollified his ſpeeches with* as it were, *if he had not taken the word* viſible *properly, and as diſtinct from that which is perceived by any other ſenſe then that of Seeing.* Gregorius de Valentia (*as* Chamier *cites him*) *granteth, That Sacraments being conſidered in reſpect of ſome conditions, which Proteſtants (whom he, as their manner*

Hoc tempore poſteaquam reſurrectione Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti manifeſtiſſimum indicium libertatis noſtræ illuxit, nec eorum quidem ſignorum, quæ jam intelligimus, operatione gravi onerati ſumus, ſed quædam pauca pro multis, eademq; factu facillima, et intellectu auguſtiſſima, et obſervatione caſtiſſima, ipſe Dominus, et Apoſtolica tradidit diſciplina; ſicuti eſt Baptiſmi Sacramentum, et Celebratio corporis, et ſanguinis Domini. *De doct. Chriſt. l.* 3. *c.* 9.

Satis eſt ad Sacramenti naturam quatenus ſignum eſt ſenſibile, ut aliquo ſenſu percipiatur, nec debet excludi ſenſus audiendi, *&c. Bellar. de Sacr. in gen. l.* 1. *c.* 14.

Ineptum eſſet viſibile verbum pro ſenſibili. Nulla enim improprietas eſſet, quæ mollirctur per particulam quaſi, vel tanquam. Nam omne verbum reverà eſt ſenſibile, id eſt, audibile. *Cham. tom.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 14.

Si de Sacramentis ſecundum aliquas conditiones, quas hæretici requirunt, loqueremur, neque nos diceremus eſſe tam multa, quàm ponimus. *Greg. de Valent. apud Cham.* tom. 4. *lib.* 4. *cap.* 6.

is, termeth Heretick) require, ſo there are not ſo many, as otherwiſe they hold there are. So though Bellarmine (*in the place above cited*) *will not admit Sacraments to be ſeals, yet this other Jeſuite* Valentia *is not ſo ſtraitlac'd, but doth acknowledge, that they are after a ſort ſeales of Gods promiſe, whereby it is confirmed unto us. So*

Fatemur Sacramenta novæ Legis eſſe ſigna, ſeu ſigilla quodammodo promiſſionis divinæ. *And again,* Sacramenta vetera fuerunt velut ſigilla quædam, quibus eſt obſignata, et firmata apud homines Divina promiſſio. *Greg. de Valent. apud Cham.* tom. 4. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 9.

the

the Councel of Trents *Catechisme doth make this one reason why Sacraments were ordained,* viz. *because we are slow to believe, and therefore Sacraments are not onely signes, but as pledges to assure us of those things which are promised unto us. And as the Apostle calls Circumcision a seal,* Rom. 4. 11. *So* Abrabaneel, *a famous late Rabbine among the* Jews, *in his Commentary on* Esay 52. 13, &c. *speaking of Circumcision, doth call it,* chotham berith, *that is, the seal of the Covenant. It is true, he speaks of it onely as a seal, whereby* Abraham *did assure himself unto God, to be his, whereas the Apostle speakes of it as a seal, whereby God did confirm his Covenant unto* Abraham. *But the Covenant being mutual, wherein God doth engage himself unto man, and man doth ingage himself unto God, the Sacraments as seales of the Covenant, serve to confirm both the one and the other ingagement. Now the Sacraments thus having respect unto the Covenant, and standing in a subserviency unto it, this reverend Author (Mr.* Blake*) having by Divine assistance composed and published a Treatise of the Covenant, which deservedly hath found good acceptance, by the good hand of his God still upon him doth now offer to publick view a Treatise of the Sacraments, which (I presume) will be no lesse accepted. The Authours former Works do sufficiently speak his worth; he needs not my Elogie, neither can it adde any thing unto him. Yet having been more then ordinarily acquainted with him above* 20 *years, (though more then half of this time the great distance, whereat Providence hath set us, hath much hindered the improvement of our acquaintance) this I cannot but say, that I alwaies held him one, whose judgment in any matter of Divinity is very much to be esteemed. What* Casaubon *said of* Persius, *may truly be said of him, as this Treatise, and his other Writings doth shew,* He is one that doth rather shew Learning, then make a shew of it. *They that in some things dissent from him, I think will do him so much right, as to acknowledge, that he is no* Theologaster, *no Smatterer in Divinity, no superficiary, or unstudied Divine. Neither is he rash and forward to vent his notions; or one that doth affect novelty and singularity in opinion, which is the garbe of many manton Wits in these*

Altera verò causa est, quòd animus noster haud facilè commovetur ad ea, quæ nobis promittuntur, credenda. —— Quemadmodum igitur in Veteri Testamento Deus fecerat, ut magni alicujus promissi constantiam signis testificaretur: Ita etiam in novâ lege Christus Salvator noster, cum nobis peccatorum veniam, cœlestem gratiam, Spiritûs Sancti communicationem polliceretur, quædam signa oculis, et sensibus subjecta instituit, quibus quasi pignoribus obligatum haberemus, atq; ita fidelem in promissis futurum dubitare nunquam possemus. *Catech. Trid. de Sacram.*

Fatemur eruditissimum Poetam eruditionem ubique ostendere, usquam ostentare negamus. *Casaub. Prolog. in Pers.*

times. It is very rare, if he decline that which is generally received; yet doth he not relie upon the authority of others neither, but * reasons and argumenes are the things, which sway with him. Where he doth a little step aside out of the road, he doth it not out of any humour of contradiction, not with any uncivil censure, or petulant expression, but as with some rational plea, so with much modest deportment. As here in this Treatise, where he holds, that the Sacraments as appendants to the Word, may be profitable to the unregenerate, and instrumentall to Conversion. And yet he doth withall largely and learnedly impugne the Physical operation of Sacraments, which doth no more follow upon the other (as some perhaps may imagine) then the Physicall operation of the Word, which all explode, and yet confesse that the Word is an instrument, or means of regeneration. And so (me thinks) this learned and judicious Author hath here competently evinced, that the Sacraments may be, not solely by themselves, but as accompanied with the Word, and as being after a sort visible words, holding out that to the eye, which the Word doth to the ear, and setting forth both Law and Gospel to those that understand the meaning of them. Some one or other particular there is besides, wherein this Author is apt to meet with either Opposers, or Dissenters: but as he is not unfurnished with grounds and reasons to support his opinion, so neither is he desirous to impose upon any further then strength of argument shall prevail. Some Digressions he hath, but they are not heterogeneal to the subject in hand, and he was moreover enforced to them, as also to those Disputes in the Poscript. Before Mr. Baxters Apologie came forth, hearing of his intentions, he expressed in a letter to me how much it troubled him, that he should have him Antagonist, whom in diverse respects he did so love and honour. And surely his Book of the Covenant doth sufficiently declare how unwilling he was to appear in a way of opposition to that worthy man. But the saying of Aristotle (though not in those words, yet to that effect) is well known and no lesse approved, Though Socrates be a friend, and Plato a friend, yet Truth is so much more. If in this Contest he sometimes shew some acrimonie which is not usual with him, it is not to be considered how he was provoked. As soon as I perused his Treatise of the Covenant, being not unacquainted with Mr. Baxters Aphorismes, I could not but observe how he doth scarce ever name Mr. Baxter (though he name him often) but where he doth approve and commend him: when he doth dissent from him, and oppose him (as he doth many times) it is still so (excepting

*Disceptatione si potes, vince, vince ratione. Cyprian. ad Demetrian.

*Ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ὄντοιν φίλοιν, ὅσιον προτιμῆν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Arist. Ethic. ad Nicom. lib. 1. cap. 6.

cepting onely, I think, where he speaks of the mannee how the Sacraments do seal; and there he could not but alter his course) as to conceal his name, and to deal meerly with his opinion. Whereas Mr. Baxter *on the other side in his Apology* γυμνῇ κεφαλῇ, *as they say, with open face doth fall upon Mr.* Blake, *and that also oftentimes in such sort, that some, favourably enough affected to Mr.* Baxter, *and his Writings, have to my knowledge expressed no small dislike of him for it.* He that will speak his pleasure, *(they say)* must look to hear something to his displeasure. *I hope Mr.* Baxter *will not interpret me so, as if I spake thus to exasperate him, or to heighten the difference betwixt him and Mr.* Blake; *This is far from my thoughts: I desire onely to apologize (if need be) for my ancient friend, so far as the justnesse of the cause doth require. Upon this account I shall makt bold to advertise the Reader, that peradventure now and then (though very seldome, I dare say) he may meet with some circumstantial mistake, which as it is nothing at all to the main, so neither is it any more then that which is incident to the best Writers. Thus, page* 581. *that is ascribed to* Granatensis, *which belongs not indeed to him, but to another, namely,* Michael ab Isselt, *who doth preface to that piece of* Granatensis, *which is intituled* Dux Peccatorum. *I might say more concerning this Authour, and the Treatise here set forth, but I would not be over-tedious. I shall therefore take off, onely praying that the Lord will be pleased to make both this Work profitable, and also the Authour still more and more serviceable to Himself, and to his people.* Amen.

Qui quod vult, loquitur, quod non vult audiet.

—— Non ego paucis (fudit,
Offendar maculis, quas aut incuria
Aut humana parùm cavit natura.
Horat. de Art. Poët.

Christopher Cartwright.

BRITISH MUSEUM

To the READER.

THe overture which I gave in the Treatiſe of the Covenant, of my intentions by Gods aſſiſtance, to ſend forth the like of the Sacraments; not a few have endeavoured to turn into a promiſe, and have much ſollicited me for performance. Which at laſt through many difficulties and interruptions is now done, and expoſed to thy cenſure; which I expect to be different, according as it ſhall meet with men aforehand principled. If contention ſhall hereby unhappily be encreaſed (as is too often ſeen in writings of this nature) my intentions will be altogether diſappointed, and expectations fruſtrated. I had never appeared on this ſubject, had I not ſeen the beſt of men in their thoughts much divided, if not perplext; and conceived ſome poſſible hopes of contributing ſomewhat towards ſatisfaction, and ſettlement. That great Ordinance of the Lords Supper appointed of Jeſus Chriſt for a more near union; through mens miſtakes (and not from the nature of the Ordinance it ſelf) hath proved the greateſt diſtraction. How mighty contentions, and vehement diſputes have of a long time been held about Chriſts preſence? Firſt, with thoſe of the *Romiſh* party; afterward with the *Lutheran* Churches? When there is a full agreement of parties that Chriſt is there, (ſuppoſing an adminiſtration according to his inſtitution) the manner of his preſence hath occaſioned all the difference: When, if men would conſider, as they confeſſe; that it is a Sacrament about which all this contention is thus driven on, they could not but ſee, that Chriſts preſence *with*, or *in*, the *Elements*, can be no more then Sacramental, in which the ſign is ſtill put for the thing ſignified. The bead is the body, and the cup the blood of Chriſt, no otherwiſe then the rock in the wilderneſſe was Chriſt. In the explication of Sacramental ſigns, there can be expected no other then Sacramentall ſpeeches: And therefore that great *Lutheran* Logician was much miſtaken, in charging the tranſgreſſion of his maxim upon *Calviniſts*, that *the proper ſenſe of Scripture is ever to be held, unleſſe the contrary can be evidently proved*, in their leaving of the letter in the words of the

the Supper, *sive τὸ ῥητὸν*, as he speaks: Taking it for granted, that no such necessity can be shewen. When it is enough to evince the necessity of a trope, that the words are an explanation of a Sacramental sign, We must not put this Sacrament at such a distance from all others, as to make the whole here rigidly proper, and all others Sacramental. Words must be fitted to the nature of the subject. But to help himself out, he wisely borrowes from *Bellarmine* an assertion, that *Reasons are not to be demanded of any that hold the proper sense, why they keep to it.* Both of them, it seems, despairing of giving any reason that is satisfying. But methinks he might blush in the use of the *Simile*, that he hath also borrowed to make his assertion good. This were, (say they) *as if any should ask of those that are in a journey, why they hold the old beaten way; and why they go in at the door, and not at the window?* When they, or either of them, can make it appear, that the old way of interpretation of Sacramental speeches is, to understand them properly, without any Metonymie; then I shall say, that the letter here is not to be left, but in the strictest rigour to be followed: But till then I shall believe them to be both out of the way. And all Sacraments being appendants to promises, it will likewise follow, that Christs presence with him that in faith takes these Elements, is no other then a presence in Spirit. Where these things are happily accorded, and all scruple laid aside, a new quarrel is raised about the subject of Sacraments. That they are institutions of Christ, and gifts vouchsafed by him to his Church, is acknowledged: But to whom they belong, and who of right can make his claim to them, is not determined; when yet the visibility of the Ordinances, and trust reposed in man for dispensation of them, (whose sight is more weak then to discern that which is invisible) necessarily concludes that they belong to visible Church-members, not in a select way pickt out of other Churches, (which is a way that no Scripture-Saint ever trod) but in as great a latitude as the profession of the Christian faith. In this, Scripture is so plain, that it is wonder, that ever it was made a controversie. Either the *Jew outwardly* was mis-nam'd, when the title of *Circumcision* was given him; and a foul misprision run upon, when a proselyte was circumcised, or a new convert in Scripture-way baptized; or else this must necessarily be granted. So that, as to title, and right of claim, if

Scriptures

Scriptures may judge, the Covenant-grant is clear. Yet as there are many that have their just right in Legacies, and inheritances, who are not judged meet for present fruition: It would be many a man's losse, even to ruine, to have that presently put into his hands, which justly might be claimed as his own. So it fares in this great Ordinance of the Lords Supper, which all that partake of, are to look upon, and improve as a memorial of Christs death; for which all are not in any possible capacity, as they are not for some other duties: And here in all reason, they that are to dispense this Ordinance, are most concerned to distinguish. And if Regeneration be the mark by which they are to be steered, it is not like a Sea-boy, appointed for the Pilot's guide, floting on the top of the water, but rather, as one hid in the bottome, which necessarily involves both dispenser and receiver in inextricable difficulties and perplexities. And when most confesse that men free from ignorance, errour and scandal, though unregenerate, must have admission; and all acknowledge, that such (will we, nill we) will enter. If it be concluded, that unregeneration is an undeniable and invincible barre to all possible benefit, and blank paper is alwayes sealed whensoever such take it; it is not yet made known how it may be dispensed by those in whose hands it is entrusted with any possible comfort. A great part of this work is, to render the way here more comfortably passable, in giving the doubting soul hopes, that yet sees not concluding evidence, in his own thoughts, of a new birth: (many of which upon principles that they have taken in, sadly reason against themselves in participation of this Ordinance) and withal, to put courage into the hands of the Ministers of Christ, to presse the power of this soul-humbling Ordinance of God, on the hearts of intelligent hearers, competently instructed in Gospel principles, whom yet they may justly have in jealousie not yet to have come up to this great and blessed work of a thorough change wrought, in the mean space differing little or nothing from the common received opinion as to the qualifications of those that are to be, or are not to be denyed admittance. Yet I thought not meet that they should go alone, but to send out upon this occasion into publick view, a just Tractate of Sacraments, which occasionally is grown into a bigger bulk then I ever intended. That which appeares clear to my sight, I doubt not but will seem otherwise in the eyes of some others. And

therefore I put it upon my account to meet, not onely with diſlike (as every one does that deals in works of this nature) but alſo with oppoſition. I heare indeed that as of old it hath been ſaid, that unregenerate men have no true right in the ſight of God, to any of his creatures; and that all ſuch poſſeſſors are uſurpers; ſo, alſo it is now maintained that all ſuch, notwithſtanding their viſible Church-intereſt, are without all right to any Church-priviledges. Though they make uſe of them, as unregenerate men do of the creatures, and by command from God muſt make uſe of them, ſo that their neglect of them is juſtly charged as their ſin, yet they are ſtill without any true right to them, or title in them. This I confeſſe with me is a ſtrange aſſertion. I ſhould thinke that thoſe immunities which Jeſus Chriſt (to whom all power is given in heaven, and in earth) of his good pleaſure, doth vouchſafe to men of meer viſible Church-intereſt, in order to bring them to an inviſible right and title, and which unregenerate men enjoy, in order to work them to a Regenerate ſtate, are their true and proper right; as the immunities which the higheſt power grants to civil incorporations; in order to bring them to a further honour and luſtre, are their juſt inheritance. When *Moſes* commanded the congregation of *Jacob* a law, this is called their inheritance *Deut.* 33. 4. By vertue of the grand charter from God himſelfe, who herein differenced them from all other nations. It is true, that the groſſe abuſe of civil immunities granted to incorporate bodies, may juſtly move the higheſt power to diſfranchize them: but whileſt the grant remaines, the priviledge is theirs: and the like abuſes of Church-priviledges, may juſtly move Chriſt Jeſus, and hath moved him, to diſchurch a people, and take his Kingdome from among them, removing his Candleſtick from them; but whileſt his Kingdome remaines, and their light by his long ſuffering-holds, their right continues. The Regenerate make a more bleſſed uſe, but the unregenerate have an equal right. There was no difference in the right of Apoſtleſhip between *Peter* and *Judas*, how great ſoever the difference was in their reſpective improvement of it. The barren tree whileſt it hath a place in the Vineyard, is within the verge of the ſervants care, and hath right to be digged, and dung'd, as well as the fruitful. To draw towards an end, and not to hold thee longer from the work it ſelf; as to the whole that thou ſhalt finde here delivered, the great thing that I crave at thy hands is,

that

that thoſe two great enemies to a right apprehenſion of truth, *Prejudice* and *Reſpect of Perſons* may be laid aſide, that ſo my reaſons may gaine, (which otherwiſe they will be denyed) an indifſent hearing: and that nothing may be charged as mine (upon any ſuppposed want of diſtinct explication) which I do not clearly own, and which men may have reaſon to believe that I ſhall diſclaime. For prevention of which, ſo far as may be in me, I have given in a liſt of *Erratas*, which I pray thee to correct before, or as thou readeſt, if it be not already done to thy hand, as in moſt Coppies, I hope, care will be taken of thoſe that are more foule: many of which do not only deſtroy the ſenſe, which were more tolerable; but lead to a contrary ſenſe. Other ſmaller faults, meerly literal, or miſpointings, or ſuch miſtakes; in a word, where that which was intended is clearly obvious, I hope I need not entreat thy candour. As for any that ſhall pleaſe to appear againſt me (as in almoſt every part of the work I know, that I have ſome of one intereſt or other that are adverſaries) I only deſire that they deale with me, as I have made it my buſineſſe to deale with others. Perſonal invectives, *Sarcaſmes* and Jeers, though upon the faireſt ſuppoſed advantage, falſifications, wreſtings of ſentences, induſtrious concealment of the ſtrength of arguments may poſſibly cloud an adverſary, but ſhall never advance the glory of truth; which ſtands not in need either of mens paſſion, or fraudulency, which will be found no better then his folly. And what name ſoever may be gained, where truth gaines nothing, let thoſe enjoy that look after it: I deſire not to be any ſharer in it. So far as I yet ſee (and I think I ſee much reaſon for it) I intend here to ſet down my ſtaffe, and to travel no further in this troubleſome way, reſolving not to change my purpoſe unleſſe I ſhall either be convinced by truth, and ſo ſhall manifeſt the change of my minde; or elſe ſee the truth in danger to ſuffer, which I do not yet ſee in any thing, which is publiſhed againſt me, and not anſwered by me. And in ſuch caſe I ſhall endeavour to take that way that truth may be beſt cleared, and the Reader leaſt troubled, which will be, as much as is poſſible, to examine adverſaries arguments, and decline perſonal concernments. The Lord grant, that all that is here ſpoke for truth, may be ſucceſful for thy Spiritual good! And if any thing, through miſtake, be let fall againſt it, that it may ſpeedily be diſcovered, that nothing here may be thy Spiritual detriment.

Thomas Blake.

Errata.

THe Title of Chap. 5. Sect. 3. is by miſtake put on the head of the leaf to the following Section; and the title of Chap. 7. Section 16. is by like miſtake put to the two following Sections likewiſe.

Page 300. It is ſaid by inadvertancy that Circumciſion was taken up again in the Wilderneſſe, Joſh. 5. 2. when indeed it was when they had paſſed Jordan and were in Canaan, I deſire that the Reader may look upon this as expunged.

Words to be blotted out.

Page 94. line 14 dele to be, p. 313 l. 6. a ſine, del. it, p. 385. l. 13. a fine, dele done, p. 443. l. penult. dele and. p. 461 l. 10 dele There followes. p. 613 l. 5 dele know. p. 617 l. 18 dele the.

Words to be added.

Page 37. line 4 adde, is not mentioned. p. 121 l. 9 are obliged. p. 164 l. 10 the minor Propoſition in a ſyllogiſme is left out, and muſt be thus ſupplyed [But men ſhort of faith which juſtifieth are Chriſtians] p. 167 l. 11 to be, p. 240 l. 30 ſpeaks ſo. p. 242 l. 2 are apt. p. 305 l. 26 Let us ſo do it as. p. 314 l. 15 Theſe may, p. 345 l. 11 a fine any thing. p. 376 l. 9 a fine where no barre is put. p. 465 l. 7. they little thought that, p. 481 l. ult. or Juſtification. p. 485 l. 20 and thus argue. p. 540 l. 9 he, p. 574 l. 8 a fine ſpeaks of. p. 634 l. 12 have not.

Words to be changed.

Page 16 line 24 r. laſt. p. 26 l. 13, 14 r. 6. p. 40 l. 15 r. *Noah.* p. 29 l. 24 r. of. p. 35 l. ult. uncircumciſion. p. 37 l. 6 a fine Divinity. p. 41 l. 14 unavoidably, irreſiſtibly, l. ult. wonders. p. 56 l. penult. nor, p. 69 l. 33 though he. p. 105 l. 4 a fine which as. p. 136 l. 6 a fine loſt. p. 142 l. 3 meer. p. 175 l. 12 accept. p. 184 l. 16 Few. p. 193 l. 13, to p. 195 l. 8 a fine taking off. p. 196 l. 6 load. p. 229 l. 7 a fine bereft. p. 236 l. 18 years. p. 238 l. 11 left. p. 240 l. 26 commonly. p. 244 l. 14 were, p. 247 l. 3 a fine ſtrangely, p. 284 l. 14 that all, p. 280 l. 16 or produce a, p. 307 l. 10 perſiſteſt, p. 341 l. 12 a fine the ſoul, p. 357 l. 19 led, p. 359 l. 8 read ver. 15, p. 360 l. 6 Thoſe, p. 396 l. 6 a regenerate, p. 403 l. 10 a fine deviations, p. 416 l. 3 flowing, p. 429 l. 10 a fine the, p. 430 l. 15 a fine Phariſees, p. 445 l. 11 a fine ſpeak, p. 448 l. 19 is moſt. p. 449 l. 18 ſayes, p. 445 l. 21 Ilart, p. 463 l. 7 or, p. 468 l. 6 a fine dealing, p. 472 l. 8 juſtification, p. 525 l. 3, 4 In order to our enquiry into it, this, l. 17 never, l. 23 ſcope, p. 550 l. 15 You, p. 567 l. 22 His blood, p. 570 l. 12 member, l. 12 before me, p. 573 l. 22 Tome, page 576 marg. directly, page 579 l. 6 aſcribes, p. 584 up to Ibid. nor, p. 588 l. 7 older, p. 589 l. 4 leſſe, l. 5 more, p. 590 l. 19 which, page 606 line 10 a fine Travellers, page 611 l. 11 takes off the force of the Law condemning, p. 614 l. 4 a fine Then, p. 648 l. 20 wait.

BRITISH MUSEUM



THE Covenant ſealed.

OR, A *TREATISE* of the *Sacraments* of both *COVENANTS*, Polemical, and Practical.

CHAP. I.

of the word Sacrament.

THe mutual relation between the Covenant of God entred with man, and the Sacraments by him inſtituted and appointed, is generally acknowledged. Sacraments are in that way bottomed on the inſtitution, that both Sacrament and inſtitution have reſpect to the Covenant; Though ſome to keep back ſuch from all intereſt in any Sacrament, that they know not how to deny to be in Covenant, have made it their buſineſſe (had it been feaſable) to have made

a divorce between them: Having therefore by Gods assistance, published a Treatise of the Covenant, I would willingly adde somewhat (the subject being of so near affinity) of the nature and use of the Sacraments, of which I know much is already said, by men of all parties and interests. Though few have written industriously of the Covenant, (and several books that carry that title have very little of the thing) yet theyare almost above number that have treated of the Sacraments. He that would have a List of names may consult *Chamierde Sacramentis*, pointing the authours out, as they have dealt in the several heads of this Controversie; as also *Vorstius*, *Enchirid. Controversiarum*: and to compleat the Catalogue (especially in the addition of *English* Writers) Dr. *Wilkins* his *Ecclesiastes*: yet notwithstanding this plenty, (in which abundance of more light by Gods mercy hath been brought forth) I suppose I may say, That much is left to be further spoken, especially in the particulars in our times most in agitation, where I think there is least need, I shall be more brief; and if in any thing I shall have hopes to adde any strength to the truth, or light where it is not so clear, I would be more large. And before I come to speak of the thing it self, it may be expected that I should premise somewhat of the name by which these Ordinances are ordinarily known. In which Papists (saith *Chamier*) have disputed much, Catholiques little, giving the reason, Because the mysteries of Divinity are not contained in words. Some have manifested their dislike of the word, seeing it is not a name given of God, nor to be found in Scripture with application to these Ordinances. *Bellarmine* will have it to be the same with Mystery, μυστήριον in Greek (saith he) is to be translated *Sacramentum* in Latine, but confesses, That though the word *Mystery* be frequent in Scripture, yet it is only once used in Scripture in reference to any of the Sacraments, and that is, *Ephes.* 5. 32. in reference to Matrimony. But neither is Matrimony a Sacrament, (as hereafter may be shewen) nor yet hath the word Mystery in that place reference to it, (in which according to *Durand* there is no Mystery) but to the Conjunction of Christ with his Church. And upon this account that Scripture useth it not in this sense, (as is confest by Protestants) some lay aside all use of it, as we find in the practice of our Dissenting brethren. As they differ from us in the subject of the Sacraments, so they differ

The word Sacrament *vindicated.*

ſer from us in the name. One with them is dipping, the other is breaking of bread, but neither of them with them is a Sacrament, to both of which terms, I have ſpoken ſomewhat. *Bellarmine lib.* 1. *De Sacrament. Cap.* 7. layes the diſlike of this name, to the charge of many of our Divines, as *Luther, Melanchthon, Zuinglius, Calvin*; But falſely, ſaith *Whitaker Prælect. De Sacramentis*, pag. 4. And *Chamier* dealing with him about it, entitles the firſt Chapter of his firſt Book *de Sacramentis in genere*, [a] The Calumny about the name of Sacrament, in which he acquits theſe Authours, and with *Whitaker* admits the uſe of the word, as it is commonly received. So alſo *Voſſius*, Theſ. 13. 14. *De Sacrament. Efficacia*; and *Vorſtius* ſpeaking in the name of Proteſtants in general, in the entrance of this Controverſie, taking notice of *Bellarmine's* defence of the uſe of the word, ſaith; [b] Here our Divines willingly aſſent, onely he ſaith they make ſome animadverſions on ſome paſſages of his making *Myſtery* and *Sacrament* to be equipollent, as alſo his Etymologie of the Hebrew word *Razi*, and the Chaldee word *Raza*. [c] *Bellarmine is deceived, and doth deceive* (ſay the *Leyden* Profeſſors, Diſput. 43.) *when he contends with Luther, Zuinglius, as though they had abſolutely condemned thoſe words.* And their unanimous practiſe ſpeaks their opinion; In Treatiſes, Catechiſmes, Sermons, conſtantly making uſe of the word, without the leaſt ſcruple about it. Religion not conſiſting in words, but things; when there is conſent in the thing, there is not contention to be raiſed about the word. In caſe we had a word in Scripture from the Pen of the Holy Ghoſt fitted to the thing it ſelf, and comprizing theſe ordinances, in that generality as the word Sacrament doth, in the common uſe of it, I ſhould then quit this name, and take to that. But ſeeing there is no ſuch word, And *Tertullian* the moſt ancient of all the Latine Fathers, (whoſe works are extant) uſing it, as *Voſſius* obſerves, *Theſ.* 6. *De Sacrament.* and ſince his time in the ſucceſſive ages of the Church it is continued, and now generally received; it were too much affectation of ſingularity to recede from it; yet I would put this caution upon the uſe of it; *That it muſt ſerve onely to denote the thing, that we treat about, and that no argument from the word, be drawn to hold out the nature of theſe Myſteries.*

But thoſe that upon this, and the like grounds, do freely admit the uſe of the word, cannot ſo eaſily agree of the reaſon of it;

[a] De Sacramenti nomine Calumnia.

[b] Noſtri hic facile aſſentiuntur, licet id quod de Græcæ vocis æquipollentia dicitur non omnino admittant: uti nec ea omnia, quæ de etymologia Hebræa & Latina dicuntur.

[c] Fallit ergo & fallitur *Bellarminus*, cum *Luthero, Zuinglio* item movet, quaſi abſolutè à vocibus illis abhorruiſſent.

The reaſon of the word enquired after.

it; how it comes to paſſe, that theſe Ordinances came to have this term, or name put upon them; why Baptiſme and the Lords Supper ſhould be called by the name of Sacraments. There are onely three opinions, that I meet withall, that are worthy to be taken notice of; and theſe drawn from three ſeveral acceptations of the word Sacrament, in prophane Authours.

Firſt, The depoſiting of money by men ſtriving for Maſteries, in Conſecrated places, (upon thoſe terms, that he that conquered ſhould take away his part; and he that was conquered ſhould leave his with the Prieſt) according to *Varro* was called a Sacrament. They collected therefore, that the Sacrament ſignifies our depoſiting of our ſelves (as I may ſay) with God, or our yielding up of our ſelves to him. As they that ſtrive for maſtery, did leave for a pledge a ſumme of money, ſo we leave our ſelves as a pledge with God. But this uſe of the word Sacrament, I ſuppoſe is more obſcure; and the analogy not ſo clear, and therefore Divines in ancient times, would ſcarce borrow this word from thence, ſo few underſtanding the alluſion, or the application of it.

Secondly, The oath which anciently Souldiers took, when they liſted themſelves to the Emperour; for faith and obedience, was called by the name of Sacrament. Therefore others judge it very probable, that theſe Ordinances are called Sacraments; in that in them every Chriſtian Souldier doth tye himſelf to his Captain Chriſt Jeſus. This is far more probable, for three Reaſons. 1. The uſe of the word in this ſenſe, was more common and received, and therefore more apt to give occaſion to the like uſe of it in theſe Sacred Ordinances. 2. The application is more clear, ſeeing our Sacraments (as God willing ſhall be ſhewn) are engagements. 3. Heathen Writers make ſuch alluſion; [d] *It behoves us* (ſaith one of them) *to ſwear to God, and Souldiers to Cæſar.* And the Fathers uſed the word Sacrament with this alluſion, as *Voſſius* out of *Tertullian* quotes two paſſages, [e] *We are at that inſtant called to the warfare of the true God, when we anſwer in the words of the Sacrament*; and elſewhere, [f] *That he may be diſbanded and ſhut out from the bleſſings of the Sacraments, never more to return into the tents of the Church.* To which may be added a third quoted by *Bellarmine*; *The Devil imitates the very things of Divine Sacraments, in idol-Myſteries, he waſhes ſome, and ſignes other of his Souldiers in*

[d] Deo oportebat & nos jurare & milites Cæſari.

[e] Vocati ſumus ad militiam Dei vivi jam tunc, cum in Sacramenti verba reſpondimus.

[f] Ut Sacramento benedictionis exauctorentur, nunquam in caſtra Eccleſiæ reverſurus.

their

their foreheads. And *Auſtine* in his Preface to the 181 Sermon *De tempore* ſaith, [g] *It is known, Beloved, that the Souldiers being to receive temporal rewards from their temporal Maſters, do firſt tye themſelves with military Sacraments, and profeſſe faithful ſervice to their Lords. How much more ſhould thoſe that war under an Eternal King, and are to receive rewards from him, bind themſelves with heavenly Sacraments, and publickly profeſſe that faith whereby they may pleaſe him.* In this *Rivet* reſts ſatisfied, as appears in his *Cathol. Orthodox. Tract.* 3. *Quaſt.* 2. [h] *The Latine word Sacrament* (ſaith he) *is borrowed from the verb* Sacrare, *and by Eccleſiaſtical Latine Writers, is taken from proceedings in war, in which the Oath wherewith Souldiers were tyed to their Captain, was called a Sacrament.*

[g] Notum eſt dilectiſſimi quod beneficia temporalia a temporalibus Dominis accepturi, prius Sacramentis militaribus obligantur & Dominis ſuis fidem ſe ſervaturos profitentur. Quanto magis ergo æterno Regi militaturi & æterna præmia percepturi debent Sacramentis cœleſtibus oligari & fidem per quam ei placituri ſunt publicè profiteri.

[h] Vox Latina Sacramentum deducta eſt a verbo Sacrare, & à Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis Latinis à militia deſumpta fuit, in qua juramentum quo milites duci obſtringebantur, vocabatur Sacramentum. Refert Clariſ. *Ed. Leigh.* Crit. Sac. pag. 270.

Thirdly, There being ſo great affinity between *Myſtery* among the Greeks, and *Sacrament* among the Latines, *Myſtery* ſignifying that which is ſecret of any kind whether ſacred or prophane, of which there are many inſtances given; and *Sacrament* ſignifying that which is made ſacred, or conſecrate, words ſeldome long holding their ſignification; Myſtery began to be taken more ſtrictly for holy ſecrets; and ſo Sacraments for Sacred ſecrets; afterwards the word *Myſtery* and with it *Sacrament* began to be uſed for ſacred things held forth in outward ſignes. The viſion of the ſeven Candleſticks ſetting out ſeven Churches, are called *Myſteries*, Revel. 1. 20. The conjunction in marriage of man and wife, ſetting forth the union between Chriſt and his Church, is called a *Myſtery*, Epheſ. 5. 32. And when Divines found no word in Scripture, to ſet out theſe Ordinances of the Old and New Teſtament, Circumciſion, Paſſeover, Baptiſme, the Lords Supper, they gave them the name of *Sacraments*, further reſtraining their ſignification to holy ſecrets, held forth in outward ſignes, and ſealing ſpiritual grace to us. This *Voſſius* takes to be moſt ſatisfactory. Though I profeſſe my ſelf ſcarce ſatisfied with the reaſon that he gives, *Theſ.* 16. and comparing it with what he hath ſaid in his 6th. Theſis, it may ſeem to ſpeak as much in favour of the ſecond opinion,

opinion, which he rejects, as this third which he followes. The reason that he assignes as taking with him is, [i] *That the Latine Fathers in the use of the word Sacrament, had much respect to the use of the Greek word Mystery.* And so in several places by him produced they had respect unto the military use of it in like manner. Here it is not for me to interpose, I suppose none is able to speak any more then conjecture, In which I leave the Reader to use his own liberty, assenting to *Vossius*, that those are weak arguments that are drawn from the use of the word, either in the first or second acceptation; and concluding that they are as weak, that are drawn from the use of it according to the third opinion; There must be a better bottom for an argument, then the bare denotation of the word, especially when it is of humane, not of Divine imposition. And the use of the word being thus taken up by man, the acceptation or use of it upon that account hath been very various, and ambiguous, insomuch that when Writers speak of Sacraments, the Reader is often at a stand what they mean by them. *Sometimes* every thing that is secret is called by the name of Sacrament; therefore the vulgar Latine (which appears to be more ancient than their number of seven Sacraments) doth not onely render the word μυστήριον, *Sacramentum*, in *Eph.* 5. 32. (upon which they take advantage to bring in marriage into the number) but frequently elsewhere, when nothing towards a Sacrament by their own confession is intended. *Having made known to us the Sacrament of his will*, Eph. 1. 9. *By revelation he made known to me the Sacrament*, Eph. 3. 3. *To make all men see what is the fellowship of the Sacrament*, Eph. 3. 9. *To whom* God *would make known what is the riches of the glory of this Sacrament, among the Gentiles*, Col. 1. 27. *Great is the Sacrament of godlinesse*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. *The Sacrament of the seven starres*, Rev. 1. 20. *I will tell thee the Sacrament of the woman, and the beast that carries her*, Rev. 17. 7. And *Tertullian* speaking of Christianity, calls it, [k] *The Sacrament of Christian Religion*: and *Jerom* saith, [l] *The Sacraments of God are to preach, to blesse, to strengthen, and establish, to hold communion, to visit the sick, and pray.* Allegorical

The various acceptation of the word.

[i] Latinos in variis Sacramenti notionibus, secutos esse Græcos, qui & ipsi μυστήριον nunc rem arcanam appellant; nunc rem arcanam sacram; nunc rem arcanam symbolicam; nunc denique rem arcanam sacram symbolicam, gratiæ spiritualis significativam.

[k] Religionis Christianæ Sacramentum.

[l] Sacramenta Dei sunt prædicare, benedicere, confirmare, communionem reddere, visitare infirmos, orare. Refert Gerardus de Sacram. cap. 1.

gorical interpretations of Scripture alſo are called by the Ancients, by the name of Sacraments. *Sometimes* every outward ſign of any thing that is holy is called by the name of Sacrament. And as they began to borrow rites from the Jews in Baptiſme, they called them by the name of Sacraments. Their Ointments and Chriſmes (yea the Croſſe it ſelf, which the Church of *Rome* makes no more then a ceremony in Sacraments) are called by the name of Sacraments. But theſe acceptations of the word are grown obſolete, and are ſo far from holding out the nature of thoſe Ordinances, which now paſſe under the name of Sacraments, that men cannot be brought to any miſtake in reading of them. The word *Sacrament* is ordinarily now taken in that ſenſe as *Auſtine* doth define it. An outward viſible ſign of an inward ſpiritual grace, that is a ſign inſtituted of God to hold out and ſeal ſaving grace to the ſoul, as afterward (God willing) may be more largely held forth. Now in every Ordinance of this nature, there is, firſt, an outward ſign open to the ſenſes; ſecondly, there is a ſpiritual grace; thirdly, an order eſtabliſhed and declared between the ſign and the thing ſignified, and ſome of theſe ſtill give the denomination. *Sometimes* the outward ſign is taken for the Sacrament, and therefore the diſtinction is ordinary between *Sacramentum* and *rem Sacramenti*. And it can be no more than a bare ſign, when the thing ſignified is apart conſidered and put in oppoſition to it. *Sometimes* the outward ſign and the thing ſignified, conſidered joyntly, are called by the name of a Sacrament, and this *Gerard* ſayes is the moſt proper and moſt uſual acceptation. *Sometimes* the order or analogy that is betwixt the ſign and the thing ſignified, is called by the name of Sacrament; and therefore *Keckerman* defines a Sacrament to be [m] *an holy order between the outward element obvious to the ſenſe, eſpecially to the ſight and the ſpirituall grace as the thing ſignified, inſtituted of Chriſt the Mediatour to ſeal to Believers the aſſurance of redemption, and with it all benefits that flow from redemption.* So that he makes neither the outward ſign, nor yet the thing ſignified apart conſidered to be the Sacrament in that definition, nor yet the outward ſign and thing ſignified joyntly conſidered, but the order or analogy that

[m] Sacramentum eſt ordo ſanctus inter rem externam in ſenſus incurrentem, et viſus imprimis objectum tanquam ſignum, et inter rem ſpiritualem, tanquam ſignatum, à Chriſto Mediatore inſtitutus ad obſignandam fidelibus redemptionis certitudinem et ſimul beneficia quæ ex redemptione fluunt, tum ſignificanda tum confirmanda.

that is held between them. *Lastly*, the word Sacrament is taken for the outward sign, with relation had to the thing signified, leading to it, and by way of seal confirming it, and in this sense it is taken by Divines when they treat exactly about it. And in that sense the Apostle takes circumcision, when he defines it to be *A sign and seal of the righteousnesse of Faith*, Rom. 4. 11. The use and office of the cutting off the foreskin of the flesh, as by way of sign and seal it stands in relation to the righteousnesse of faith is there held forth. This therefore we may well judge to be the most proper acceptation of it. *Keckerman* therefore as soon as he had defined a Sacrament, as before, presently tells us, that [n] *the word of it self is a concrete, and signifies the thing or subject with the manner of it, that is*, saith he, *with the relation added to it: yet it may be taken for the abstract, that is, for the relation as* (saith he) *we have put into the definition.* But seeing the word of it self, by our Authors confession, is no abstract, but a concrete, and the Apostle in his definition doth so consider it, we have just reason in that sense to speak to it; and so in this whole Treatise I shall take it. And before I proceed in any further Enquiry, the Reader may justly expect such a definition as may serve as a thred through the whole Discourse. But my intention being to enquire something into the nature of Sacraments in mans integrity, (that so the Work may answer the Title) *A Treatise of the Sacraments*, but mainly to insist on those that are appointed by God for his people in the Covenant of Grace, I am necessitated to put off the enquiry after such a definition that may give satisfaction, till I come to that which I intend as my principal Subject. Yet that by the way he may not be wholly left unsatisfied, I shall here offer such a definition that may comprehend all Sacraments as well in the Covenant of Works, as in the Covenant of Grace; intreating him to forbear any strict enquiry into the reasons of it, untill he come into the full Body of the Discourse, where by the definition, which (God willing) shall be given of Sacraments in the Covenant of Grace, and from Scripture at large confirmed, he may easily judge of the definition of Sacraments in general, and thus I suppose it may be held out. A Sacrament is a sign instituted of God for the use of his people in Covenant, to signifie and seal his Promises upon Terms and Propositions by himself prescribed and appointed.

[n] Sacramenti vox per se concreta est, et significat rem sive subjectum, cum modo rei, id est, cum relatione rei additâ: interim tamen potest etiam usurpari pro ipso abstracto, id est, pro relatione ut nos quidem in definitione usurpavimus.

CHAP.

CHAP. II. Sect. I.

Of Sacraments in mans state of integrity.

I shall leave the word which is of least moment, being not of divine original, and come to enquire after the thing which must be distinguished before it can be defined either in the general what a Sacrament is, or what this or that Sacrament, *viz.* Baptisme or the Supper of the Lord is in particular. Now Sacraments (being instituted of God for the use of men) in tendency towards their happinesse must be considered according to the several states of man, and dispensations in which God hath manifested himself to him. And man may be considered either in his state of integrity, or in his fall, either before sin, or under it. For the state of integrity enquiry is made, whether man enjoyed any Sacrament at all, or were in capacity of any? In which we have *Thomas Aquinas* his conclusion, Part 3. Quest. 16. art. 2. in the negative, [a] *That man in innocency needed no Sacrament, neither for any remedy of sin, or perfection of his soul.* His followers (it seems) not satisfied, with his determination, unlesse they themselves may have the interpretation of it (yet not daring to adventure on a contradiction of their master) are at odds among themselves about his meaning, enquiring what he means by necessity, and what by innocency: whether he means *Adams* own state, in which he actually stood, or that which he should have attained if he had stood in his integrity? A labour worthy of their pains, had they before hand had assurance that an unerring oracle had uttered it: But others have concluded, that the tree of life in Paradise was no other then a Sacrament to our first parents, and it is marvell that *Aquinas* who denies it, hit not on that of *Austin*, to have made up at least a fourth objection, that [b] *In other trees there was nourishment, but in this a Sacrament.* For the clearing of this point I shall lay down several propositions.

Distribution of Sacraments.

[a] In statu innocentiæ homo non indigebat Sacramentis, nec pro remedio peccati nec pro perfectione animæ.

The tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil were Sacraments.

[b] Erat homini in lignis aliis alimentum, in hoc Sacramentum.

First, *That all Sacraments whether in the state of integrity or under sin, must answer to the Covenant which they are appointed for to ratifie and confirm.* Now the Covenant of God entred with man in his state of integrity, was for his preservation, not for his reparation, as I have shewed in a Treatise of the Cove-

Positions tending to the illustration and confirmation of it.

nant, Chap. 3. pag. 10, and so must this tree of life in case it have the nature of a Sacrament be a Sacrament of preservation, not restitution. And so *Thomas Aquinas* his foundation, on which he builds, that man in integrity needed no Sacrament, because the whole need not the Physician, but those that are sick, *Matth.* 9.12. is answered. There being a Covenant for mans preservation as well as his restauration, there may be a suitable Sacrament for preservation also, and so there is a plain fallacy in his argument, *à dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*, because our Sacraments in the state of sin are for recovery from the disease of sin, he will have it to be so in all Sacraments even before our fall into sin. *Chamier* returning answer to this argument, distinguishes of persons subject to sickness; ° *Some are actually sick so are all men* (saith he) *in the state of sin; some are in possibility or danger of sickness, having a principle in them capable of it, either more immediate or remote*; so it was with man in integrity, he needed Physick for prevention, not for cure; to keep him in the state in which he stood that he might not fall: not to recover him out of evill being fallen.

° Resp. ægrotos, alios actu reles dici, quales omnes homines post pecatum, alios potentia, in quorum natura principium est morbi propinquum vel remotum.

Secondly, *The Covenant of works passing between God and man in an immediate way without any reference had to Christ*, (as hath been largely shewn, and objections answered, Treatise of the Covenant, pag. 13. &c.) the Sacraments annexed must needs be *without reference to Christ likewise*: I know many learned men suppose that Christ was a Mediatour between God and the Angels, and between God and man in his integrity: and these will have the tree of life, *Gen.*2.9. to be a symbole of Christ, as the bread and wine in the Lords supper, which indeed necessarily followes upon that supposition: but that falling all the supposed relation of sign and thing signified between the tree of life and Christ falls with it. That opinion of theirs referring the tree of life to Christ they suppose hath strength from that speech of Christ to the Church of *Ephesus*; *To him that overcometh I will give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God*, Revel.2.7. which all Interpreters refer to Christ, seeing there is no life but in Christ, 1 *Joh.*5.12. *He that hath the Son hath life, he that hath not the Son hath not life.* As also from *Revel.*22.2. speaking of the new *Jerusalem*, it is said, *In the midst of the street of it and of either side of the river was the tree of life, &c.* which can be no other but that Sun of righteousness with healing in his wings.

wings, *Mal.* 4.2. But neither of these places serve their purpose, nor is the argument drawn from thence at all cogent. The tree of life in the literal Paradise was a symbole of immortality, and everlasting blisse, which man persisting in obedience should have enjoyed, whether on earth or in heaven, still remained in Gods choyce to determine; In the state of sin this could not be without Christ, and every symbole of it, therefore in this state leads to Christ. But it followes not that it was so in mans state of integrity. He should then have enjoyed it, by an immediate gift from God, & not through Christ, whose whole work was not to keep man in *statu quo*, as before sin, but to recover from sin into which he was fallen. In those places of the *Revelation* there is (after the manner of the visions of that book) an allusion borrowed from that tree in Paradise, which as *Ravanellus* observes was a type of immortality. This tree assured man of it in Paradise on tearms of bedience. In the state of sin the same is to be had through Christ on Gospel tearms and conditions. In case any will assign the work of mans support in any transcendent way to the second person in the Trinity, who is said to uphold all things by the word of his power, without any reference to his work of mediation, as to be incarnate: as I dare not assert it, so I will not contend about it. But in this I am confident the substance of our Sacraments is Christ incarnate, and all the benefits of them is through and by Christ, but so it was not in the Sacraments in Paradise.

Thirdly, *The life promised in the Covenant of works to man in case of obedience, was not barely a prorogation of his being or preservation from dissolution to an immortality in nature.* This he might have enjoyed and have continued for ever perfectly wretched, and so the performance of the promise should have been a curse, and no blessing. As it was said by our Saviour of *Judas* upon his great sin of betraying Christ, *It had been good for that man that he had never been born*, Matth. 26.24. So it might have been said of *Adam*, though he had never sinned it had been good for him that he had never been created, and therefore those that see no more towards bliss, in this promise of life then a perpetuation in being, according to the vulgar acceptation of it, understand that speech of God concerning our first Parents, *Gen.* 3.22. *And now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever*, to be a speech of mercy to keep man from

an immortality of miſery: and according to that opinion the curſe threatened for tranſgreſſion had been ſuffered, and the bleſſing affixt to obedience at once enjoyed, which is the greateſt of paradoxes; life then (as elſewhere I have ſhewed) in the promiſe compriſes true bleſſednes, a fruition of all that ſerves to make happy, and a freedom from all that tends to miſery, ſo that man lived no longer then he ſtood and ſinned not; death in its meaſure immediately ſeized, though the full execution in the higheſt degree to ſome is delayed, to others the whole reverſed.

Fourthly, *The names given to theſe reſpective trees muſt not be accounted vain* (as it fares many times with names given by men) *ſeeing the Spirit of God hath affixed theſe names to them.* But ſomething muſt be found in the trees, or from God by the trees, anſwering the names that they carry: When God gave *Abram* the name of *Abraham*, which ſignifies *a father of multitudes*, Gen. 17.5. the event we find anſwered, how improbable ſoever (when the name was given him) it appeared; *Therfore* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *ſprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, ſo many as the ſtarres of the skie in multitude, and as the ſand which is by the ſea-ſhore innumerable*, Heb. 11.12. *Solomon* was called *Jedidiah*, 2 *Sam.* 12.25. which ſignifies *beloved of the Lord*, and was not barely ſo named, but indeed beloved, *Nehem.* 13.26. *Among many Nations there was no King like him who was beloved of his God.* The name of that wonderfull birth, *Eſay* 7.14. was *Immanuel*, which the Spirit of God hath interpreted, *God with us*, *Matth.* 1.23. he was ſo named, and this he did effect, 2 *Cor.* 5. 29. *God was in Chriſt reconciling the world to himſelf, not imputing their treſpaſſes unto them.* Our firſt Parents therefore were to expect ſome way both life and knowledge from theſe trees: They had their names in reality, and not by way of fiction, or fancy given to them.

Fifthly, *This tree of life with that other of the knowledge of good and evil had not any natural power or innate efficacious vigor, to anſwer their names in giving life by the taſte, or eating of them*, as Satan bore the woman in hand concerning the one of them. This I know hath been the opinion of ſome, which falſe ſuppoſition hath occaſioned an hot and curious diſpute, whether this tree ſhould have given man life totally and wholly to a full immortality? or whether it ſhould have preſerved his life to ſome definite time of ſome thouſands of years? But the contrary is plain

plain both by reason and experience, and so the ground of this dispute is taken away.

This appears, first by reason. [d] *Trees* (as *Chamier* well observes) *are below men, yea, below other creatures that were made for the use of man, being capable of a vegetative life*, onely for growth, but not of sense, and so could not confer on man by any power from themselves either life or knowledge. Some that stickle for this opinion see the force of this reason, and therefore yeeld that it is above them to produce any such effect directly. But indirectly they say there may be such an efficacy; Meates that are singularly suitable to nature have their work, in a direct way on the animal spirits for a life of nature, and indirectly upon the organs of the inward senses. A good constitution (which a wholesome dyet works) serves to the preservation of health, and hath hereupon its work upon the faculties of the mind, and consequently preserves life, and increaseth and quickneth knowledge. [e] But (as *River* well observes) all the trees of the garden might in this sense have been called trees of life, and trees of knowledge of good and evil, as well as those two trees in the midst of the garden: All of them being for food, and to keep men in a due temperature both of body and mind.

As the truth of this appears in reason, so also by experience, in that tree forbidden; when *Eve* listened to Satan and did eat of it (and her husband by her sollicitation) knowledge was not gained but lost, which mankind sadly knowes; For that speech of the Lord before mentioned, *Gen.* 3.22,23,24. *And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil. And now least he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live for ever. Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drave out the man, and placed at the East of the garden of Eden Cherubims and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life*; which may seem to imply that in case man had been permitted to have put forth his hand, and eaten of the tree of life, he had lived for ever, in such an interpretation we should scarce conceive the tree to be any creature of God, but an omnipotent agent, standing in opposition against God, when God for sin had denounced against man the sentence of death, this tree against this sentence would give him life;

[d] Arbores enim infra homines sunt, imo infra animalia, quia ne sensus quidem capaces fuere ergo propter aliud & ex institutione, adeoque Sacramenta.

[e] Sed hac ratione omnes arbores horti potuissent arbores scientiæ boni & mali appellari. Par est enim credere, Deum qui ad eum hominis in statu integritatis constituti arbores illas creaverat, eis etiam talem vim & succum indidisse quo hominis innocentis corpus non gravaretur sed alacrius esset ad omnes suas functiones, & per consequens organa sensuum &c.

What;

f Quid audimus? an ſuam Adæ incorruptionem à quo jam decciderat reſtituere poterit fructus ille?

f *What is it then we hear?* (ſaith *Calvin*) *can that fruit reſtore to Adam the integrity that he had loſt?* Me thinks the former part of the two and twentieth verſe ſerves well to interpret the latter. *Behold, man is become like one of us.* Even as the tree of knowledge of good and evil made man like God, in a full omniſcience, ſo the tree of life would have rendred him equally like in immortality. If we confeſſe an Irony in the former, as is concluded by Interpreters, we muſt underſtand the like, or ſomewhat much like it, in the latter. Man will have like immortality in ſin, as he had omniſcience by ſin. Therefore he puts, and keeps him out of Paradiſe, that now being deprived of the thing, he might not delude himſelf in the outward ſign or Sacramental repreſentation of it.

Sixthly, It remains therefore *that theſe trees were ſet apart of God from other trees of the garden for a Sacramental uſe*, having no more power of themſelves to confer life or knowledge then water in Baptiſme or bread and wine in the Lords Supper to conferre pardon of ſin or ſpiritual life on the ſoul. g *The tree of life was ſo called* (ſaith *Wollebius*) *not from any innate quickning faculty, but from a Sacramental ſignification.* *Paræus* indeed putting it to the queſtion whether the tree of life be ſo called by reaſon of the effect that it had produced had man ſtood, or by way of ſignification? ſaith, *theſe two opinions in his judgment may be joyned*, and ſayes, h *The tree might give life as food or as phyſick, and preſerve from age till man ſhould be tranſlated into an heavenly immortality*, and then proceeds to ſhew how it is a Sacrament of life. But ſure theſe opinions are altogether inconſiſtent, Sacraments are ſo ſigns that they are not phyſical cauſes of the thing that is ſignified. If they had any ſuch effect in nature, then all myſtery in the Sacrament ceaſed and there needed no word from God to clear it, every man would know that food hath a natural tendency to life, and phyſick to health, if there were no Scripture. If we were able to make it good that they were phyſical cauſes of life and knowledge, then we muſt diſclaime their Sacramental uſe; but ſeeing that cannot appear, and the contrary is evident; This other muſt be aſſerted, It may eaſily be made out that the tree of life was a Sacramen. Man was to put forth his hand

g Arbor igitur vitæ non ab inſita vivificandi facultate ſed à Sacramentali ſignificatione ſic dicta eſt.

h Sine dubio habitura erat hæc arbor ſeu ut cibus ſeu ut medicina vim conſervandi hominis ſanitatem & vitam, ne corpora vergerent in ſenium, aut ſentirent defectum, donec in cœleſtem immortalitatem tranſirent. Deinde data fuit homini in vitæ Sacramentum.

to

to eat of it, as the Jewes did the Passeover, and we do the Lords Supper. i *And as often as he ate of it, or had his eye upon it* (as *Calvin* well observes) *he was to remember from whom he received life and blisse, and by whom he was preserved and upheld, that he had no principle of life and blisse in himself, but as he received it from God, so by his favour and free Grace it was continued:* And to mind himself of his duty on what tearms he stood with God, and upon what condition his life and blisse was continued: whilest he sinned not he must not dye, as long as obedience lasted he must enjoy a life in happiness. Others add that it shadowed out Christ, by whom both he and the Angels stood in happinesse: but I have already spoke my thoughts to that particular. But how to bring that other tree of the knowledge of good and evil so aptly to hold out the nature and use of a Sacrament, is not so easie: and I find many Interpreters asserting it, but not any that I can meet with demonstrating it. And it must be confest that this Sacrament did herein differ from all other Sacraments. Those did consist in their use; This in mans abstinence from it. In this it is said thou shalt not eat: In the Passeover and the Lords Supper the communitants must eat. But God hath it in his power to institute Sacraments according to pleasure, by way of prohibition, as well as by way of injunction. In other Sacraments in the due use, men attain to the good that is promised; In this by abstinence man should have avoyded the evil threatned. In eating of the tree of life, while man persisted in obedience, he was assured of life, that was a seal and pledge of it. And while he abstained from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, he had like assurance of freedom from death. This alone was a negative Sacrament, and it was proper to this Sacrament onely, that not the fruition of good, but the avoydance of evil was the thing signified. The reason of the name is the enquiry of many why it was called the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? Some that would deny it to be any Sacrament, say that it had the name from the natural effect that it was apt to produce, being created to quicken or ripen man in the use of his reason, conceiving that our first Parents were created weak in knowledge, of an infant understanding: And to know good and evil (that is, choose the good, and refuse the evil) in the Hebrew phrase setting out the use of reason, as, *Esay* 7.16. Before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good: They say this

i Voluit igitur hominem quoties fructum arboris illius gustaret in memoriam revocare unde vitam haberet: ut se agnosceret non propria virtute, sed Dei unius beneficio vivere; Neque esse intrinsecum bonum ut vulgo loquuntur sed à Deo provenire.

this tree was to work them to this maturity in knowledge. How false this is of our first Parents weakneſſe in knowledge is clear by the names that man gave to all creatures upon ſight, as he had dominion over them, ſo he underſtood the nature of them, as alſo in that ſpeech that he uttered concerning *Eve*, when the Lord upon her creation brought her to him to give her in marriage. The Wiſe man ſayes that God made man upright, *Eccleſ.* 7. 29. And this uprightnes comprizes mans whole conformity to God in all in which his image doth conſiſt, which was as the Apoſtle tells us, in knowledge, as in righteouſneſſe and true holineſſe, *Col.* 3. 10. To avoid ſuſpition of inclination to any ſuch opinion, ſome when they ſpeak of mans firſt eſtate, purpoſely avoid the word innocency, and chooſe to uſe the word integrity. And how unapt the fruit of a tree could poſſibly be in nature to produce any ſuch effect, that which was ſpoken concerning the tree of life being applyed hither may demonſtrate. And whence this opinion came but from the Devil I cannot tell, who told our mother *Eve*, that God did know that in the day that they eat thereof their eyes ſhould be opened, and they ſhould be like unto gods, knowing both good and evil, *Gen.* 3. 5. He was the firſt that vented it, and ſhe was the firſt that believed it; when ſhe ſaw that the tree was good for food and pleaſant to the eye, and a tree to be deſired to make one wiſe; ſhe did take and eat thereof, *Gen.* 3. 6. The taſte it ſeems was the taking quality; the other trees were good for food, and doubtleſs lovely to the eye, but this alone anſwerable to the name with the Devils comment upon it was a tree to be deſired for this end, but ſhe found the contrary; light was not only not encreaſed, but put out, ſo that man now is a beaſt by his own knowledge; others therefore conclude that it had this name, not from any ſuch effect that in nature it was apt to produce, but by reaſon of the event that followed, and upon the taſte of it muſt of neceſſity follow; now they experimentally know the good which they had by ſin loſt, and the evil which they had incurred. [k] *As a Phyſician* (ſaith *Rivet*) *that hath the theory of health, and ſickneſſe, underſtanding what health is to deſire it, and what ſickneſſe is to ſhun it, yet falling into ſickneſſe he hath another manner of knowledge out of his own experience.* *Pererius* the *Jeſuit* diſlikes this Interpretation; he that pleaſeth may read his reaſon on theſe words, and *Rivets* vindication, *Exer.* 18. in *Gen.* He fixes upon a third, that this name was given

[k] Quemadmodum qui medicus eſt theoretice vim morbi & ſanitatis bonum cognoſcit, in morbum delapſus amiſſa ſanitate nova quadam ratione, per experientiam bonum ſanitatis, & malum morbi cognoſcit.

given to this tree, upon occaſion of the ſpeech of Satan, bearing *Eve* in hand, that in eating of it, ſhe ſhould gain the wiſdom of God, to know both good and evil; And therefore it had the name of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. But whoſoever gave the name, whether God himſelf who placed the tree in the garden, or *Adam* who to his coſt knew it, or *Moſes* that wrote of it, it is not probable they would borrow a name from Satans deluſion; The former therefore which the *Jeſuit* confeſſed to be an opinion moſt received, I judge to be moſt probable, and till I ſee more ſhall not recede from it.

SECT. II.

Corollaries from the former aſſertion.

Neceſſity of the uſe of means for our help and ſtrength in the way of faith and obedience.

FIrſt, hence we ſee *the neceſſity of the uſe of means, for our help and ſtrength in wayes of faith and obedience, in all the wayes preſcribed and appointed by God,* In caſe our firſt Parents in their integrity were to make uſe of a Sabbath to give God a time in a more ſolemn way as we ſee, *Gen.*2.2,3. and alſo of Sacraments; who are we, that we ſhould caſt off Sabbath and Sacraments? that our faith and obedience ſhould be riſen to that growth, and arrived at that height, that all helps ſhould be laid aſide? It is no marvel, that upon this account, ſo many that ſeemed to be ſomewhat, refuſing the aſſiſtance of God provided, wholly degenerate and come to nothing: In caſe it be replyed, that *Adam* was left to his own keeping, carried his life in his own hands, but we have another manner of ſupport and defence; *We are kept by the mighty power of God through faith unto Salvation,* 1 Pet. 1.5. and ſo we need not to be ſo ſollicitous of our ſelves. I anſwer, though there be truth in that which is objected, yet the objection is to no purpoſe, as eaſily may be manifeſted: Jeſus Chriſt would not have provided Ordinances in New-Teſtament-times, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt: in caſe he would not have his to make uſe of them, and had not ſeen that they ſtand in need of them: we are not ſo kept, that we ſhould ſit ſtill, no more then *Iſrael* was in the conqueſt of the promiſed Land. Gods power in our preſervation

ſervation, and our diligent (though not diffident) and anxious care very well ſtands together: Elſe *Peter* had not from thence inferred, *wherefore gird up the loynes of your mind, be ſober and hope to the end, for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jeſus Christ*, 1 Pet. 1. 13. Nor yet having ſet out Satans vigilancy annext that exhortation, *Whom reſiſt ſtedfaſt in the faith*, 1 Pet. 5. 9. nor yet had the Apoſtle *John* told us that *He that is begotten of God keepeth himſelf, and the evil one toucheth him not*, 1 Joh. 1. 18. Souldiers are taught to go out and fight in the Name of the Lord, and that he covers their head in the day of battel; yet this doth not abate any thing of their watchfulneſs, or diligence; they do not caſt off weapons either offenſive, or defenſive. This is an artifice of Satan, to lay mens throats open to him for ſlaughter, and deſtruction, under pretence of Divine protection.

Sacraments are without Spiritual profit to thoſe that live in breach of Covenant.

Secondly, Know that *there is no ſaving benefit received by any Sacraments which are ſeales of the Covenant, longer then men in Covenant, make it their buſineſs to keep up to the tearms of it*; *Adam* was in a Covenant of life from God, upon tearmes of preſerving himſelf from ſin, and had it by a Sacrament confirmed to him, he wilfully runs upon ſin; the tree of life now can no more give life to him: Satan then perſwades to believe, that in eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, they ſhould as gods know both good and evil. He now perſwades, that being baptized in water, which holds forth the Spirit and blood of Chriſt (if they underſtand any ſuch ſymbolical repreſentation) they partake of the Spirit, and blood of Chriſt: And that taking the Bread and Cup, they enjoy all that they ſignifie and hold forth: That no more then a Sacrament, needs to make up a Chriſtian compleat. This is an outward work, that may be done, and all luſt alive within; An eaſie work to go through, and here man would fain reſt; but look further to the duty, to which theſe engage; otherwiſe thou wilt find no more of Chriſt in the Sacrament, then *Adam* found of life in the tree of life. See Mr. *Burges Spiritual Refining*, Ser. 19.

Covenant falling all Sacraments relating to it neceſſarily fall with it.

Thirdly, It yet further followes, *That a Covenant falling to which Sacraments are annext as ſignes, and ſeals, the Sacraments fall together with it.* The Covenant of works being no longer of uſe to the attainment of Salvation; the Sacraments which under that Covenant were appointed, are taken out of the way,

and

and no uſe of them remaint. I know that it is aſſerted by as learned hand, that Chriſt doth not abſolutely make null or repeal the Covenant of works, but that it ſtill continueth, to command, prohibit, promiſe, and threaten; yet confeſſing this aſſertion to be difficult, and diſputable, to which I readily yeeld; and therefore in a buſineſs of no greater moment then this is, I had rather ſuſpend, then either ſubſcribe or oppoſe. He and I are wholly agreed, as to that for which it is here produced, ſeeing he ſaith, *We muſt neither take that Covenant as a way to life; as though we muſt get Salvation by our fulfilling of its conditions; nor muſt we look upon its curſe, as lying upon us remedileſſely.* This is as much as I aſſert, or rather imply in that which I ſay, that the Covenant of works is of no uſe to the attainment of Salvation: upon which the Sacraments of that Covenant, we ſee are laid aſide with it: we hear no more of a tree of life, or the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. *Rivet Exer.* 40. on thoſe words. *Leſt he put forth his hand, and take of the tree of life, and live for ever,* Obſerves a reſemblance between that proceeding of God, and the Churches proceeding in keeping unworthy men from the Sacrament: *The* [1] *unworthy* (ſaith he) *are kept from the Sacrament, leſt they ſhould eat of thoſe ſignes to their judgement: And ſo God made uſe of this prohibition as a leſſer excommunication called ſuſpenſion, for the further humiliation of man, that he might ſee himſelf to be unworthy of life, being kept from the outward ſymbole or Sacrament of it.* But me thinks this is ſo far from reſemblance of that kind of Excommunication which is called the leſſer; that it is a ſentence in terrour farre above that which is higheſt, and greateſt: And this it ſeemes my Author ſaw, and therefore addes: [m] *Furthermore, ſuch a Sacrament was unmeet, or unſuitable to fallen man; becauſe the tree of life was not given to reſtore a man dead to life, but to preſerve life in a living man; therefore* Adam *being dead by ſin, and his condition changed, the Sacraments were to be changed likewiſe.* Two ſorts of men then are here fitly to be paralleled with *Adam*,

[1] Quemadmodum nunc ex Dei inſtituto à Sacramentis arcentur indigni ne ſibi Symbola ſumant ad judicium & condemnationem, ita hac prohibitione uſus eſt Deus tanquam excommunicatione minori quam abſtenſionem vocant, ad hominem magis & magis humiliandum, ut ſe indignum agnoſceret vita qui à vitæ Symbolo arcebatur.

[m] Præterea tale Sacramentum, homini lapſo, non erat amplius aptum; quia arbor vitæ non data erat ut vitam reſtitueret mortuo ſed ut viventem in ſtatu vitæ commodo conſervaret. Ergo Adamo per peccatum mortuo mutanda fuerunt Sacramenta.

Adam, in this proceeding of God againſt him.

1. Thoſe that God caſts out of Covenant, taking away their Candleſtick, and his Kingdom, refuſing to be their God, or to own them as his people; God denying them his Covenant, all muſt deny them the ſign and ſeal of it.

2. Thoſe that caſt themſelves out of Covenant, and apoſtatize from the faith of Chriſt Jeſus. Where there is no Covenant in which men may expect happineſs, where there is no profeſſion of ſuch expectation, there is to be no Sacrament; there the ſeal is put to a blank, and theſe Sacred Myſteries are prophaned: Therefore I cannot but marvel at thoſe, that deny the Church of *Rome* all being of a Church; and affirm, that they are in no Covenant-relation to God; yet yeeld that they have Baptiſme in truth among them, explaining themſelves, that it is as a true mans purſe in the hand of a theefe. But the purſe, and the man ſtand not in that relation as Covenant and Sacrament; the Covenant being gone, the Sacrament hath no truth of being remaining.

Satans imitation of God in his precepts of worſhip to his followers.

Fourthly, Let us yet ſee, *how forward Satan is to imitate God, in preſcribing a way of worſhip to his ſervants; and how ready the world is to follow Satan in theſe things by him preſcribed.* God appointed a tree of life, as a ſign and pledge of immortality; in the due uſe of which man might have lived for ever, and been preſerved from the evils, and infirmities of age; and Satan among thoſe in the world, that are his for worſhip, hath of old found out a fiction of certain meats, called by them *Ambroſia*, and certain drinks named *Nectar*, and *Nepenthe*; which the gods uſing to take, were preſerved from age and death. It cannot be imagined, how they ſhould reach ſuch a fancy, but that the poſterity of *Noah*, had ſcattered ſome Divine light of this tradition among them. Their gods, who were but men, and ſome of them the worſt of men, bringing all wickedneſs to renown by their example, being ſuppoſed to have an immortal being, muſt have ſome way or means to come up to immortality. As they had their meats, and drinks, that made immortal; ſo alſo their fountains (found out by *Cadmus*; to whom they aſcribe the firſt invention of letters) *Aganippe*, *Hippocrene*, *Caſtalius* near to *Parnaſſus*, at which their Muſes drunk; which raiſed them in eloquence. Theſe they have borrowed from theſe ſymboles of the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge of good, and evil;

evil; dreaming of a Phyſical operation, and not underſtanding any Sacramental efficacy: God alſo inſtructed his people iu the uſe of ſacrifices, which we know was with his people from the beginning; and I cannot believe with ſome *Jeſuits* that this was of the dictates of nature: which (as they ſay) led them without any revelation, to the uſe of ſacrifices: For in what ſenſe ſoever we take ſacrifices, Nature could never teach man to give it unto God. If we take it more largely, for a gift tendred, reaſon would tell, that the Divine Majeſtie ſtands in no need of it: And in caſe we underſtand it more ſtrictly, and make the deſtruction of that which is offered eſſentiall to a ſacrifice: how could this in reaſon enter into any mans thoughts; that when a man had ſinned, a beaſt muſt dye? And that of the Apoſtle, *Heb.*11. doth fully contradict it, *Abell offered by faith*; and faith is not of nature, but above it. This then was a worſhip of God by inſtitution, not commanded in the firſt, but ſecond Commandment: and this Satan is ready to follow. As there was ſcarce a Nation, as the Orator obſerved, but worſhipped a god: ſo there is ſcarce a Nation, that did not ſacrifice to thoſe gods: and the Apoſtle gives us to underſtand, what thoſe gods were: *The things that the Gentiles offer in ſacrifice, they offer to Devils, and not to God,* 1 Cor.10. It is his worſhip, and he teacheth his the way of it. As in duties of worſhip, there is this imitation ſeen, ſo in wonders, and prodigies in like manner, there is an emulation: God had his miracles in *Egypt*, and Satan his. We know the general Deluge in the ſacred Hiſtories; in which none were preſerved from death, but *Noah* and his family, by an Arke preſcribed of God: Heathens muſt have a fable in imitation, and tell us of drowning of the World, onely *Deucalion*, and his wife *Pyrrha*, in an Arke preſerved likewiſe. And as *Noahs* Arke reſted on the Moutains of *Ararat*, upon the aſſwaging of the waters: ſo theirs reſted on the Mountain of *Parnaſſus*. We have a narrative of *Jonah* caſt into the Sea, and received by a Whale; and after three dayes, and three nights, caſt ſafe upon the ſhore: Satan muſt ſet up his *Arion*, and make him famous in his Hiſtorians and Poets; A skilfull Harper of *Greece*, having by excellency in muſick, gained a great ſumme of money in *Italy*, and *Sicilia*, returning to his own Countrey with his treaſure; Mariners with whom he agreed for his Fare, greedy of his money, caſt him into the Sea: a Dolphin delighted with his muſick, carries him

him safe, and landed him at *Tenarus*. See the relation and application, elegantly brought home to this purpose by Dr. *Abbot*, Lect. 15. on *Jonah*: making notable observations of Satans policy. In case the Narrative carry any truth in it by his wonders, so far as his art, and power can reach. Satan then makes it his business, to disgrace Gods miracles, and cast dishonour upon them by his imitation: though he falls farre short of the Originall, as he there shewes: and followes him as little *Ascanius* his Father, with very unequal steps. And in case we take it, for a meer fiction: (which is his judgement upon it) his art is no lesse observable to discredit, as farre as in him lyes, the writings of Scriptures: When this miracle of *Jonahs* shall be Preached and published in the world, *Arions* fable shall be produced, that like faith may be yeelded to either of both. See Mr. *Burges Spiritual Refining*, Pag. 131,132. Where this thing in many particulars is enlarged. And the more high the wayes of Religion are raised of God in a Spiritual way, the more easie it is for Satan, who is a spirit, to delude. The Spirit is the great Gospel-promise, to be poured out on all flesh; that is, on men of all sorts, *Joel* 2.28. God will be served in types and shadowes no longer, but in Spirit, and truth, *Joh.*4.23. When the *Jewes* gloried of Circumcision, as that which did denominate them a people of God, and distinguished them from all other Nations: and urged the necessity of it to salvation: the Apostle tells us, that they *are the Circumcision, that worship God in Spirit*, Phil.3.3. Satan now on the other hand, can take the hint, and heighten his way in a destructive manner to Gospel wayes. All outward Ordinances shall now be decryed as formes, and beggarly rudiments: and with Circumcision in the letter laid aside, though they be Ordinances of the Spirit it self; in which the Spirit expresses its power and efficacy. 1. The written Word, which was dictated by the Spirit, 2 *Pet.*1.19. (is the sword of the Spirit, by which it exercises his power on the soul) must be laid aside as a dead letter, and over carnal. The Ministers of the Word, that great gift from the Fathers right hand, *Ephes.*4. 11. set over the flocks by the holy Ghost, *Act.* 20.28. on this pretence are to be cast off with *Moses* and *Aaron*; taking too much upon them, when all the Congregation is holy: notwithstanding for a real confutation, when this Spirit was first given in glory, it came upon the heads of his Ministers, in forme of tongues,

tongues, fiery, cloven, *Act.* 2. 3. To let all know (in that great appearance that was there) that their tongues are sanctified of God, to Preach the Word in power and life to all Nations. And as the gifts of the Spirit encreased; so the Ministers of the Spirit were multiplyed; and that very title and name given *Ministers of the Spirit*, 2 Cor. 3. 6. And the mind of Jesus Christ made known, that these in a peculiar order, distinct from other men; are set apart to preach the Gospel, as the Priests under the Law in a peculiar order were to wait at the Altar, 1 *Cor.* 9. 13, 14. Upon the same pretence, Sacraments must be laid aside; the Baptisme of the Spirit is pleaded, for the overthrow of the Baptisme of water: Though the Apostle that first spake by the Spirit after it was given in glory, doth argue the clean contrary, *Act.* 10. 47. *Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the holy Ghost as well as we?* They that have the Spirit, will be raised in zeal for the honour, and establishment of every Ordinance of God by the Spirit: the more spiritual men are, the more care they will take to advance the Word, the Ministers of the Word, Sabbaths, Sacraments. Let us then observe his imitations, his falsifications: He vents doctrine of his own, sets up wayes of his own, that carry a resemblance of Gods wayes: And *similitude*, is *mater erroris*: we shall never heed them, as long as we know they are the Devils: but when he transformes himself into an Angel of light, and puts the stamp of God upon his own coyn, we must not be ignorant of his sleights; but to have our senses exercised, to discern between good and evill.

CHAP. III.

Whether there were any Sacraments from the fall to the institution of Circumcision?

THe next consideration of Sacraments, is in mans fallen condition under a Covenant, not of works, but grace; not for mans preservation in life, but his restitution to life. And these are to be distinguished according to Gods way of dispensation of his Covenant to his people; which is wont to be done into three periods. The first is from the fall till *Abraham*, or unto the time

A further distribution of Sacraments.

time that God entered Covenant with him, and his ſeed: which *Suarez* ſaith, according to the common account, doth end at the giving of the Law by *Moſes*, when the old Law began; yet Circumciſion (which was in uſe long before the Law) continuing the ſame under the Law; he determines the law of nature at that time, when Circuciſion began. The ſecond from *Abraham* till Chriſt. The third, from the firſt comming of Chriſt in the fleſh, till the ſecond comming of his to judgement. The firſt juncture of time, hath uſually been known by the time of the Law of nature. The ſecond, the time of the Old. And the laſt, the time of the New Covenant. Why the firſt of theſe ſhould bear the name of the Law of nature, I can read of none that have given ſatisfaction: The phraſe ſhould ſeem to imply, that then men had no more light, then that of nature, for their guide in the wayes of God. But this is evidently falſe: God did not then begin by way of ſupernatural revelation, to ſpeak to men in the world. *Suarez* in *tertiam partem Thomæ*, Tom. 3. Diſput. 4. Sect. 1. taking upon him to anſwer the queſtion, hath much to amuſe the Reader, nothing to ſatisfie him: he ſayes, [a] *The law of nature, is the dictate of reaſon, ariſing not onely out of natural, but ſupernatural light.* And in ihat ſenſe the Goſpel is the Law of nature. Concerning this ſpace of time, whatſoever is the period of it, much enquiry is made, whether there were any Sacraments at all inſtituted of God, and enjoyed by his people on earth? Concerning which, I ſhall deliver my thoughts in ſeveral propoſitions.

[a] Lex naturæ, intelligitur dictamen rationis, non ſolum ex naturali, ſed etiam ex ſupernaturali lumine ortum.

God had his Church and people in that juncture of time.

Firſt, *That God had his Church and People, with a way of worſhip pleaſing to, and accepted by himſelf in thoſe times.* This evidently appears out of the Hiſtory: *Abell, Henoch, Noah, Melchizedeck* (who without all doubt lived in thoſe times; and *Job* as it is commonly received) ſpake ſo much, and the Apoſtles Comment, or obſervation of thoſe times, *Heb.* 11. makes it more evident: *Abell offered to God a more excellent gift then Cain, and obtained witneſſe that he was righteous*, Heb. 11.4. They both made viſible profeſſion of the ſame God, and both ſacrificed to God: and God put a difference between their gifts. An embleme of the Church in all ſucceeding ages, which is that great houſe, where are veſſels of honour, and diſhonour. *By faith Henoch was tranſlated, that he ſhould not ſee death: and was not found, becauſe God had tranſlated him: for before his tranſla-*

tion

tion he had this teſtimony, that he pleaſed God, Heb.11.5. and as he affirms, that it was by faith that he was thus tranſlated: ſo he proves it he had this teſtimony, that he pleaſed God. *But without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe him,* verſ. 6. *Noah became heir of the righteouſneſſe by faith,* verſ.7. God had his worſhip then, as appears by *Abells,* and *Noahs* ſacrifice: and in *Melchizedeks* function, *Gen.*14.18. *Who was a Prieſt of the moſt high God, taken from among men, and ordained for men, in things appertaining to God, that he might both offer gifts and ſacrifices,* Heb.5.1. The Woman had all that time her ſeed, and the Serpent his, who kept up their mutuall enmity: as *Cain,* and *Abell, Noah,* and the men of the world, *Lot,* and the men of *Sodom* do give witneſs: God had a people of Covenant-holineſs; thoſe *Sons of God that ſaw the daughters of men that they were fair, and took of them wives of all which they choſe,* Gen. 6.1. He had a people truly holy: *Lot* had that Epithete of *juſt,* 2 *Pet.*2.7. the name of *a righteous man*: *Noah* had that witneſs of God, that *he ſaw him righteous,* Gen.7.1. and of *Abel* the Apoſtle ſaith, that his *works were righteous.*

Scripture makes no mention of any Sacraments or Sacramental ſigns in that time.

Secondly, *We read not of any Sacrament appointed of God for theſe times, nor of any Divine Ordinance or ſign that comes up to the nature of a Sacrament.* Thoſe that may be inſtanced in, with moſt colour are, 1. That of ſacrifice, both before, and after the floud; and that of the Rain-bow immediately upon the floud. That of ſacrifice comes more near up to the nature of a Sacrament, then that of the Bowe; But how both come ſhort of the nature of a Sacrament, in the ſenſe generally received, and now to be ſpoken to, I ſhall God willing in a more fit place make known.

Sacraments in ſubſtance of the ſame nature with the Covenant.

Thirdly, *If there were any Sacraments in thoſe dayes appointed of God, for his people in Covenant, they muſt be of the ſame nature, as to the ſubſtance of them, and thing ſignified by them, with thoſe under the Law, and now in the dayes of the Goſpel.* There was one common ſalvation, ours and theirs; one and the ſame Saviour, theirs and ours; we and they were under the ſame promiſes; Their Sacraments then muſt ſeal theſe promiſes. *Noah* was an heir of righteouſneſs of faith: Theſe ſuppoſed Sacraments could then ſigne and ſeal no other thing then that righteouſneſs.

Fourthly, *Though we do not reſt upon that argument* à non dici

Scripture silence a most probable argument that in those times there was no Sacrament.

dici ad non esse; *because we read of no Sacarments in those dayes, to conclude, that there was none then appointed or in use: yet we may conclude that it is an high presumption in any in this last age of the world to undertake to assert any Sacraments in those times.* This were indeed contrary to that which the Apostle warns, *to presume above that which was written,* 1 Cor. 4. 6. Where Scripture is silent, how dare we speak? Scripture silence affords an argument of far greater probability for the negative, that in those times there was no Sacrament in use, then all the imaginary conceits which men can invent or find. For the affirmative, that there were Sacraments then appointed: The old *Rabbines* had their traditions, concerning Gods transactions with his people in that age. *Weemse* in his Divine exercitations, *Exer.* 16. pag. 61. tells us, that the *Hebrews* say, that before the Law was written, God gave to *Moses* seven Precepts, which he delivered by tradition to his posterity after him. These they call the traditions of their fathers which he there reckons up; but not any one concerning Sacraments. It is then sure a vain labour for us at such a distance, to have any thoughts of finding them out. Many *Jesuites* bestirre their wits, to conclude Sacraments in those times. To save labour of further search, for that which is of no greater necessity: the Reader may find much of what they have said, in *Chamier, de Sacramentis in genere, lib.* 1. *cap.* 8. which Chapter he entitles, *De Sacramentis in lege naturæ: Suarez* will by all means conclude, that there was then some Sacrament for the remedy of Original sin, grounding himself on this which he puts into his margin, Pag. 40. Colume 2. [b] *That Divine providence is to take care of all ages*; taking it fot granted, that providence is defective: if a standing Sacrament in any age of the Church be wanting, and that there is no way in Divine providence to save an infant from Original sin, but the actual application of a Sacramental sign. Election cannot obtain it, nor Regeneration, nor Justification by the Spirit and blood of Christ effect it, without a Sacrament to make application of it. The *Jesuit* might know, (and if Divines on our part might be heard, they would make known,) that Sacraments are not the remedy against Original sin, but Christ, and the righteousnes of faith in Christ, which is the thing signified, and sealed in the Sacrament: and the people of God enjoying means in those times to attaine this righteousnes, *Heb.* 11. 7. they were not without a remedy:

[b] Divinæ providentiæ est omni ætati providere.

Him-

Himſelf ingenuouſly confeſſes there is nothing in Scripture, reſpective to thoſe times, nor in tradition, of any ſuch Sacramental remedy; nor do any of the Fathers (as he ſaith) mention it, before *Auſtin*. And *Auſtin* (as he alſo acknowledges) ſpeaks of it doubtingly, & what he ſpeaks by way of conjecture, is not conſiſtent (as he obſerves) with his own doctrine elſewhere: In which the modeſty of that Father is farre to be preferred before the *Jeſuites* boldneſs in it; who concludes there was ſuch a Sacramental remedy though not inſtituted of God, but left to the Parents liberty to make uſe of ſome one, according to their own will, when this aſſertion of his is as inconſiſtent with his own doctrine as *Auſtins* can be; & that upon a manifold account, as might be ſhewen. 1. He ſcarce knowes how to make it out, that Circumciſion was any remedy at all againſt Original ſin: ſeeing that Sacrament did not conferre grace by the work done, but by the merit, or diſpoſition of the doer; which is not found in infants. 2. He himſelf confeſſes, that many infants dye in their mothers wombe; and yet have no remedy provided, either in the law of nature, or the old Law, or Law of grace; that is, neither before the Law, under the Law, or in Goſpel-times. 3. Water is not alwayes at hand (as he not abſurdly hints, though a Miniſter with them is ſcarce wanting, who ſet up Midwives for the work) and then the infant dyes remedileſſe: All this he thinks to help with a diſtinction. [c] *Though* (ſaith he) *God hath not provided for each one in particular, that the remedy provided in general for all ſhould be applyed to them: yet he hath provided ſuch a remedy as far as in him lyes.* But foreſeeing, that there would be ſome impediment to hinder the application of this Sacramental remedy to ſome, this he permits. This is a ſpeech beſeeming a *Jeſuit*, that God provided (*quantum in ſe*) a remedy, as though it had been above him to have avoyded theſe impediments. If the *Jeſuites* poſition muſt ſtand, that God is ſo tyed up with theſe limits, that he cannot take away Original ſin from infants, without application of ſomewhat that is ſenſible: He could have made ſuch proviſion as he forbade *Sampſons* mother, whileſt with child the drinking of wine, or ſtrong drink, or eating any unclean thing, and that reſpective to the infant; becauſe he ſhould be a *Nazarite* to God from the wombe, to the day of his death, *Judg.* 13. 7. ſo he could have enjoyned the mother to have taken that, which might through grace annext, have had that efficacy

[c] Quanquam enim non de ſingulis in particulari provideret, ut eis efficaciter applicaretur remedium generaliter omnibus proviſum: tamen quantum in ipſo eſt omnibus provident.

in the infant in the wombe, to take away Original ſin, as they conceive water hath on an infant new-born; yea, God is ſo far from doing, what in him lyes, reſpective to many infants, for proviſion of a remedy of this nature, that he orders that ſuch a ſuppoſed remedy ſhall not be applyed. He with much ado, makes Circumciſion a remedy to deliver from Original ſin, Pag. 51. Yet God took order in his Law, that it ſhould not be adminiſtred before the eighth day, and in that interim, between the birth, and the eighth day, it muſt needs be, that many dyed: and ſo by the law of Heaven, they were debarred of a remedy through grace provided.

But here he is oppoſed by divers of his own party, who hold that the faith of the Parent, is ſufficient to take away Original ſin from the infant: for which opinion he quotes *Bonaventure*, Diſt. 1. Art. 2. Queſt. 2. *Rich.* art. 1. 5. 9. 1. & 2. And *Chamier*, lib. 1. cap. 8. *de Sacramentis in genere*, Sect. 6. quotes alſo *Vaſquez* for the ſame opinion. Theſe place merit in the Parents faith to work to the juſtification of the infant; a merit not *ex condigno*, but *ex congruo*: and for merit of this nature, a faith informed, void of Charity is ſufficient ſay they: Here our Author takes two exceptions againſt his friends. 1. ſaith he, [d] *They argue from a falſe ground, for faith informed will not ſerve for this kind of merits eſpecially to merit grace for another.* And ſecondly, *they do not* (as he ſaith) *ſufficiently ſet forth the force and efficacy of this remedy. To make it infallible* (*as it muſt be, if it be a true remedy*) *merit* de congruo *is not ſufficient, ſeeing it hath not alwayes infallibly its effect: But a Divine promiſe is neceſſary, and this promiſe* (*ſaith he*) *they ought to ſhew that maintain it.* So that one part gives too much to the application of a ſenſible ſign to the infant, and the other over much to the merit of the Parent. *Abulenſis* on *Matth.* 25. Queſt. 677. comes nearer to *Bonaventure*, *Richard*, *Vaſquez*, then to *Suarez*; holding, that infants before Circumciſion were delivered from Original ſin, in that they were born of believers, not requiring (as *Rivet* obſerves, *Exer.* 88. in *Geneſ.*) any application of faith in the Parents to the infants in any Sacrament for that work, who might

[d] Sed hi authores in hoc, & falſum ſupponunt, quia revera ad meritum de congruo non ſufficit fides informis, & præſertim ad merendam alteri gratiam & ſanctitatem, & præterea non latis explicant vim, & radicem hujus remedii; quia ut eſſet infallibile, quod neceſſarium eſt, ut eſſet verum remedium, non ſatis erat meritum de congruo, quia non ſemper & infallibiliter effectum habet, ſed neceſſaria erat divina promiſcio, & hanc oportet oſtendere.

might be dead before the Sacrament was administred to them. The same opinion is undertaken of late, in behalf of the infants of Christians, to prove the infallibility of their salvation, whether dying before or after Baptisme. I have enough on my hands already, and am not willing to launch out into this controversie: I onely say. 1. I find infants of believers, not onely of the faith of the Elect, but of visible profession in Covenant; the Scripture is cleare for a Covenant in this latitude. 2. That salvation, according to Scripture wayes, is within the verge of the Covenant, and doth not go beyond it. The Scripture leaves men out of Covenant, in an hopeless condition. 3. As there is salvation for all sorts and degrees of persons of age in Covenant, but not to be extended to all of those sorts, and degrees, to reach every individual person; so in a parallell way we may think of infants; I know no text giving us universal assurance of their happiness; in case there were, I suppose there were much more cause for believers, to begge of God their infants death, then with *David* in prayer to seek their life: there being full assurance of their happiness dying, and so much fear of their condemnation, living to see the temptations to which in their growth they are subject. We find salvation entailed upon qualifications of grace, but not upon any age or period of life. 4. There is as much found in Scripture giving us hopes of the salvation of the infants of all in Covenant (as to their infant-state) as to the infants of those that are most exact in keeping of Covenant: As much is said for the honour of infants of Parents of a faith barely dogmatical, as of the infants of those that are actually in grace, and justified by faith; The infants of all such (yea, of the worst of such) are *the servants of God*, Levit. 25.42. *they are born unto God*, Ezek. 16.20. they are *the children of God*, Ezek. 16.21. they are *holy*, *Rom.* 11.16. 1 *Cor.* 7.14. Either then we must carry it out to all the infants of the visible Church, or else we cannot assure it to the infants of invisible members. And therefore the Schoolemen afore mentioned, justly ascribe as much to a faith informed, as to that which is formed; respective to the good of the issue of such believers. 5. All that is spoken in Scripture of the blessednes of the seed of the righteous, may as fairly be extended to them through the whole course of their lives, as to the times of their infancy, promises being not put with any such restraint, as to have an end when their infancy is expired. The

most

most ample of promises which we find, is in *Esay* 59.21. There it is promised, that *the Spirit shall not depart out of the mouth of thy seed or thy seeds seed*; but this rather belongs to them of years, then of an infant-condition. If it be said, that many infants of the righteous persevere not, but cast off the seed of grace received; I answer, the grace of perseverance is necessarily required to make blessed, and blessedness is promised; we know temporal blessings are made over by promise to the seed of such. *His seed shall be mighty upon earth, wealth and riches shall be in his house*, Psal. 112.2,3. Psal. 37.25,26. *I have been young, and now am old, yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread. He is ever merciful and lendeth, and his seed is blessed.* The opposition that is found between the letter of promises, of this nature, and the event which the experience of every age observes, hath wrought a great conflict in mens spirits, how to reconcile them. And this hath been the result of all, that they are not to be understood without their due limits; and several have been put. I shall not stand to enter into the dispute, onely I say, experience doth as much oppose the literal meaning of true blessedness to all the seed of the righteous, as of temporal prosperity; one must therefore have its due limits, as well as the other. To wind up this whole discourse concerning Sacraments in that juncture of time: God then had his Church in which there was salvation. *Henoch* walked with God, and yet without faith it was impossible to please God, *Heb.* 11.6. *Noah* was an heir of the righteousness of faith, *Heb.* 11.7. a righteousness in which the Apostle desired to be found for salvation, *Phil.* 3.8. yet in all that juncture of time, there was no written Word, in which the succeeding ages have everlasting life, *Joh.* 5.39. God had other wayes of discovery of himself to his people for life. So the Church might answerably be without Sacraments: howsoever we judge salvation to be thereby either conveyed or sealed. God that tyes us to Ordinances, is himself free, and in what way he pleases, may communicate blisse, and give assurance of it. The likest conjecture that we can make of Gods ordering by providence, that in this juncture of time (from the fall to the time of *Abrahams* call) there should be no Sacrament, nor any such supposed remedy known, to acquit infants from Orinal sin, is, to declare the freedom of God, that as he pleases to ordaine Sacramental signes, so he is not tyed to them, or his hands

bound

bound up by them: but as he saved without Sacraments before the floud, and after, to the time of *Abraham*, and infants under the Law dying before the eighth day; so he still saves in the want, though not in the sinful neglect, much lesse in the contempt of these Ordinances.

CHAP. IV.

Of the definition of a Sacrament.

THe next consideration of Sacraments in mans fallen condition is, from *Abraham* unto Christ, in the time of the dispensation of the Old Covenant; In which those known Sacraments, *Circumcision*, and the *Passeover* were of force, and given in charge of God to his people: and together with those Sacraments extraordinary (or such as come near up to the nature of Sacraments,) The *Cloud*, the *Red-Sea*, *Manna*, and the *Rock*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2, 3, 4. But intending to speak of Sacraments in general, and there being no essential difference between the Sacraments, under the Old and New Covenant: One and the same definition, containing whatsoever is essential to a Sacrament in any of them, as many wayes might be made manifest. Their names are promiscuously used, the cloud that *Israel* was under, and the sea that they passed through, is called by the name of Baptisme, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. and so also is Circumcision, *Colloss.* 2. 11, 12. The thing signified, and benefit received, is in every one the same. The Apostle comparing those that did eat of *Manna*, and drank of the *Rock* in the Wilderness, with believers in Gospel-times, that partake of the Lords Supper saith, *They all ate the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ*, 1 Corrinthians 10. 3, 4. And, we may say the same of those that did eat of the Passeover, As Christ was that bread that Manna did typifie, *Joh.* 6. 49. 50. so it was he that was held out, and his death shewed forth in the Passeover, 1 *Cor.* 5. 7. I shall therefore wave this different consideration of them, and make it my businesse to enquire what a Sacramen is, and to make discovery of the generall nature of it which in case out of Scripture I can reach, that will serve for a bottome

Sacraments under the old & new Covenant of one and the same nature.

bottome on which all that I intend to ſpeak may be grounded. *Bellarmine* ſpends a whole Chap. in enquiry, whether a Sacrament can properly be defined? quoting ſeverall Schoolmen for the negative; That it cannot be defined, *becauſe a Sacrament is not one of it ſelf, but an aggregatum; one by accident*, or at leaſt not *ens reale, no real being*; and thoſe things that are but one accidentally, or not really, are below a definition. He quotes others in the affirmative; Some, that it may be defined imperfectly; others, that it admits of a perfect definition. After a diſtinction laid down very little to the purpoſe, (one member of the diſtinction being by his own confeſſion not conſiderable by Divines) he concludes that a Sacrament morally conſidered (as it ought to be conſidered by Divines) may be defined, having a reall being, and according to its own way of being, it is one. Morall Philoſophers define (ſaith he) a Kingdome, a City, a Family, though they be not one phyſically, but by aggregation; ſo do Divines define a Church, a Councell, or Sacrament, which are one in being no other way. *Suarez* agrees with him, *Diſput. 1ª. de Sacramentis, Sect. 4ª.* which *Whitaker, prælect. de Sacr. pag. 4.* acknowledges to be true. So that he obſerves, it is agreed that they may be defined, and I wiſh we could as well agree upon a definition. It would be an endleſſe work to reckon up, and it would no leſſe then tyre the Reader, to read all the definitions of a Sacrament, which may be found among thoſe that treat of this ſubject. *Bellarmine* reckons up ſix ſeverall definitions of thoſe that either really are, or at leaſt he would have to be of his party. Two of which, he ſaies, are gather'd out of *Auſtin*, the third is from *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, the fourth is from the *Maſter of the ſentences*, the fifth is the definition of the *Catechiſme of the Councell of Trent*, and the laſt, he ſayes, is found with *Gratian. Bellar. lib. 1. de Sacramentis in genere Cap. 11.* And *Cap. 13.* he names two others, one of *Scotus*, and the other of *Occam.* which he ſaies, *Chemnitius* blames with the other; yet *Cap. 14.* obſerving a great difference among us (as he ſaith) in our definitions of a Sacrament, ſaith it is an evident argument that we are departed from the truth which is one, when his own party can keep the truth, and differences with it. *Whitaker* confeſſeth, that *Luther, Melancton, Chemnitius, Martyr*, do differently define a Sacrament, but all their definitions (he ſaith) come to one. He reſts in the definition that *Calvin* gives, *lib. 4. Inſtitut. Cap. 14.* which he defends

A Sacrament may be defined.

againſt

againſt the objections of *Bellarmine* who ſpends the whole ſixteenth chap. of his book againſt it. And a definition indeed ſingularly exact. But ſeeing the Spirit of God himſelf hath furniſhed us with a definition of a Sacrament, which either explicitely expreſſeth, or virtually comprizeth all, that according to Scriptures can be required in a Sacrament, I ſuppoſe that will carry moſt authority, and this the Apoſtle deliuers, *Rom.* 4. 11. *And he received the ſign of Circumciſion a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith.* This *Whitaker* ſaies,[a] *is a plaine and brief definition of a Sacrament, and if we could be content with the Scriptures we ſhould not deſire a better. Prælect. de Sacram. Cap.* 2. *pag.* 3. See *Pareus* on the words, The adverſaries quarrells (he ſaith) hath forced Divines to look out further; but I think we ſhall beſt ſtoppe their mouths, in holding faſt to the letter of Scripture; And this is therefore my Reſolution. And *Peter Martyr* on *Rom.* 4. ſayes, *I Scarce think there is any place, in which the nature of Sacraments is ſo briefly and explicitely laid down, as in thoſe words of* Paul, *in which Circumciſion is called a ſeal.* But before I come to the opening of this definition, (which may ſeem ſcarce full, in caſe we look only to that which is explicitely delivered; I muſt take out of the way ſome objections made againſt it.

[a] Hæc brevis ac perſpicua definitio Sacramenti eſt, ut mihi videtur. Primo enim σημεῖον pro genere ponitur, hoc eſt, Signum externum aut ceremonia. Deinde σφραγὶς δικαιοσύνης, hoc eſt, ſigillum juſtitiæ, quæ ex fide ſcilicet eſt, rem Sacramenti & finem & uſum declarat; Ut ſi poſſemus eſſe Scripturis contenti non meliorem definitionem deſideraremus.

Firſt, It is plauſibly objected, that this is a definition of Circumciſion onely in particular, and therefore can be no definition of a Sacrament in generall. The collection is not ſound from the *ſpecies* to the *Genus*; If man be defined by reaſon, or riſibility, it will not follow, that *Animall*, every creature with life may be ſo defined.

Vix putoullum extare locum, quo tam breviter, tam explicite natura Sacramentorum proponitur, quam his Pauli verbis quibus circumciſio vocatur ſignatum.

Objections againſt this definition.

Firſt, To this *Pareus* in his anſwer to the ſixth doubt on *Rom.* 4. ſayes, [b] *That which belongs to every ſpecies, is rightly applyed to the Genus; that which belongs to every particular, is juſtly applyed to all*

[b] Quod omni Speciei ineſt toti generi recte tribuitur. Sicut igitur valet: Homo, Equus, & quodvis animal ſentit, movetur; & ſenſus ac motus differentia ſy ſtatica generis recte dicitur: ſic valet: Circumciſio, Paſcha & quod vis ſignum fœderis eſt σφραγὶς addita fœderi, obſignationis cauſa, Ergo omne ſignum fœderis eſt σφραγὶς juſtitiæ fidei: & hoc pro generica differentia Sacramentorum recte habetur.

universally, A man, A horse, and every other Creature of an animal life is sensible, moves, &c. and therefore it is rightly said that every animal is sensible and moves: so it is rightly said that the Passeover, the Lords Supper, and every other Sacrament is as a sign, (which adversaries confesse) *so a seal of this righteousnesse,* and therefore that which is said by the Apostle of this Sacrament in particular, is true of all in generall.

Secondly, I say, the Apostle mentions there nothing properly to Circumcision, as distinguishing it from other Sacraments; all that is in the definition, with equall reason belongs to all Sacraments, as well as to Circumcision, and distinguishes them onely from other Ordinances; what is said of *Abraham* in this text, might be applyed to the *Eunuch*, or the Jaylour, changing alone the name of Circumcision into Baptisme. He received the sign of Baptisme, a seal of the righteousnesse of the faith, that he had being unbaptized.

Secondly, It is further objected by *Bellar. lib. 1. de Sacramentis, Cap* 17. and after him by others, that Circumcision is not here said to be a seal universally to any faith, but only a seal of the individuall faith of *Abraham*, and then it can neither be a definition of a Sacrament in the generall, nor yet a definition of Circumcision, the distinct species of it, which is cleere in that it is expressely said, that it was a seale of the righteousnesse of the faith that he had being yet uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that beleeve. But onely *Abraham* could be such a father, and therefore *Abrahams* Circumcision, not every mans is here held forth.

This I have fully answered, Treatise of the Covenant, Chap. 26. pag. 187, 188. in my assertion of the purity of the Old Covenant, and therefore I shall not now stand to repeat.

Thirdly, It is objected, this will ill agree to the Circumcision of others, that after *Abraham* did receive this Sacrament; It cannot be fairely said, that *Isaac* received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousnesse of the faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised, seeing he was not in the faith till after Circumcision; and that is no definition of Circumcision, that agrees not to all mens Circumcision; that is no definition of the species, that agrees not to every *individuum*.

Answ. Neither is it needfull that that additionall particle which is proper to *Abraham*, as a leading person in the Covenant,

nant, to enter into it, should agree to all mens Circumcision: He was in the faith, and had it sealed; *Isaac* was confederate with him in Covenant, and was upon that account to be circumcised, which engaged to actual faith; and upon actual believing it sealed this righteousnes of faith to him: This precedency of faith is a separable adjunct, and comes not into the definition. To make the definition full and clear, the whole text of the Apostle is to be taken into consideration with the context, and all that in the History, *Gen.* 17. to which it relates, hath relation to it, all which is vertually in the words comprized; where we may observe,

1. The Person receiving, or by right interessed.
2. The thing received.
3. The end or use.
4. The thing signified or sealed,

The Person receiving, or by right interessed is *Abraham*, and giving, and receiving being relatives (as *Parens* on the words observes) if *Abraham* received it, it is necessarily implyed, that there is some one that gave it; Christ sayes, *Joh.* 7. 22. *Moses* gave Circumcision to the *Jewes*, because he delivered unto them a Law concerning it, *Levit.* 12. 3. but God gave it in charge to *Moses*, as we may see there, vers. 1. as; *Gen.* 17. 9, 10. he had before given it in charge to *Abraham*; And therefore Christ saith, that Circumcision was of the Fathers. God is then the author, as *Abraham* the receiver of Circumcision.

Abraham that thus received Circumcision from the hand of God may be considered,

1. As a man, so he stood in no other relation to God, then barely as his creature, and with others in the world was without God, and not within the verge of his Covenant, and for seventy and five years he thus continued,

2. As a professor of the faith, and worshipper of the true God, renouncing the gods that he had worshipped in *Charran*, and professedly serving the Lord Jehovah onely.

3. As a man upright, and sincere in the Covenant, comming up to the termes proposed of God, and walking perfect before him. In all of these capacities *Abraham* may be considered, as any other of the sons of *Abraham* that are sincere and faithful. In the first capacity he had no right to Circumcision; all that are in that condition, are called by the Apostle Circumcision: yet

it was not of neceſſity to his intereſt in the Covenant, or Circumciſion, the ſigne and ſeale of it, to be ſincere in Covenant; though it be neceſſary to the attainment of the grace of the Covenant, and mercy ſealed in the Sacrament. As others came into Covenant, and were intitled to the initiating ſign and ſeale, ſo might *Abraham*, but others came in upon a bare profeſſion: as thoſe multitudes of Proſelytes that joyned themſelves to *Iſrael*: One of which was *Doeg* an *Edomite*, 1 *Sam.*21.9. had he not been of *Iſrael* by profeſſion, he had not been detained in the Sanctuary before the Lord, upon any religious account, as we find he was, ver.7. And had he been right in the Covenant, he had not had ſo many things in charge againſt him, neither had the *Pſalmiſt* ſpoken in that language that we read of him. The Eunuch, as we have cauſe to think, had an heart right with God, but it was not ſo with *Simon Magus*, as *Peter* expreſly tells him, *Act.*8.21. *Abraham* then is conſidered as a man profeſſedly in Covenant, when he received this ſign of Circumciſion.

The thing received is here Circumciſion, which I ſhall ſpeak to onely, as of a Sacramental kind; and not conſider it in the individual nature of it, as the initiating Sacrament of the Old Covenant, held out under that external rite of cutting off the foreſkin of the fleſh.

The uſe of it is, to be a ſign and ſeal for ſignification, and ratification to thoſe that received it.

The thing ſignified and ſealed is, *the righteouſneſſe of faith*, ſo it is alſo called, *Heb.*11. Elſewhere it is called *the righteouſneſſe of God*, Rom.10.3. being freely given to us of God, and onely able to juſtifie us in his ſight; but chiefly, becauſe it is wrought by Chriſt, who was not meer man, nor barely a creature, but the *true God*, as St. *John* ſtiles him, 1 *Joh.*5.20. This righteouſneſs of God is applyed to us, and made ours by faith, *Phil.*3.9. and therefore as it is called, the *righteouſneſſe of God*, ſo alſo here and elſewhere, the *righteouſneſſe of faith*. This text being thus cleared, a full and compleat definition of a Sacrament may be found.

The definition of a Sacrament.

A Sacrament is a ſign appointed of God, to be received of his Covenant-people, to ſeal the righteouſneſſe of faith unto them.

I know there is ſomewhat put into the definition of a Sacra-

ment

ment by ſome that treat of this ſubject, which is not here in words expreſt, and therefore upon that account, this definition may be challenged as defective; as 1. The Miniſter by whom it is to be diſpenſed from God to man. But whether this be eſſential in a Sacrament or otherwiſe, (as afterwards is to be enquired into,) it is ſufficiently implyed. In caſe it muſt be received from God by his people in that way, and from that hand that he himſelf in his Word hath appointed. 2. The Sacraments contain as well a profeſſion of our duty towards God, as Gods tender and ſeal to man, of which here is nothing ſaid. But this we ſhall find, both in the ſign and ſeal (which are both mentioned) neceſſarily included, and as it appears that it is comprized, ſo to make it more clear and explicite, it may by the Reader be added.

CHAP. V. Sect. I.

Of Sacramental ſignes.

I ſhall here pnrpoſely wave ſeveral Schoole-niceties, as in what predicament a Sacrament is to be placed: Taking it in the whole nature of it (as conſiſting of a twofold matter, the one outward and earthly, which is the viſible ſigne; the other inward and heavenly, which is the thing ſignified: and of a twofold forme; one outward, which is the due participation of it, according to the way preſcribed of God; the other inward, conſiſting in the analogy between the ſigne, and the thing ſignified) it muſt needs be an *Ens aggregatum*, and ſo not capable of any place in that ſeries of being: And ſigne, and ſeale, being clearly relatives; I ſhall leave the Reader to informe himſelf from learned *Keckerman*, in the third Book and eighth Chapter of his *Syſteme of Philoſophy*: what is the *Relatum*, the *Correlatum*, the relation it ſelf, the foundation, and the *terminus* in this Sacramental conſideration; and ſhall go on to lay open the ſeveral parts of this definition. The whole of it being comprized in this text of the Apoſtle, every part affords ſome doctrinal Obſervation. In the firſt place I ſhall obſerve that,

Sacrament,

Sacraments are ſignes.

The truth of this obſervation is ſo clear of it ſelf, that it needs no proof; Taking the word Sacrament in the largeſt ſenſe that we can ſpeak of it (in which it falls ſhort of theſe Goſpel-Ordinances known by that name) it is yet *Sacræ rei Signum, the ſign of an holy thing*: And might be made good by a particular induction, not only in thoſe that we receive as Sacraments, whether extraordinary as the Cloud, the Red-Sea, Manna, and the Rock, which the Apoſtle parallells with Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper, 1 *Cor.* 10.1,2. But alſo in the ordinary ſtated Sacraments, by a ſtanding law to be obſerved. In Circumciſion there was a foreskin to be cut off, in the Paſſeover a Lambe to be eaten: In Baptiſme there is water to be applyed, and in the Lords Supper bread and wine to be taken, eaten, and drunk; God condeſcending in mercy to our weakneſs, by earthly things to informe our judgments, and ſtrengthen our faith in that which is heavenly. Though Papiſts are much put to it, to find an outward ſign in ſome of their Sacraments, (as indeed in ſome of them there is none at all) yet they yeeld to this truth; that Sacraments have their ſigns, knowing that to be a true, though not a full definition, that a Sacrament is an outward viſible ſign of an inward ſpiritual grace. That we may come to a right underſtanding of Sacramental ſigns, we muſt

First, know what a ſign in general is.

Secondly, the ſeveral ſorts and kinds of ſigns, ſo farre at leaſt as will conduce to a right underſtanding of the point in hand; and

Laſtly enquire what Sacramental ſigns are, and their properties.

What is meant by a ſign.

[a] Signum eſt res præter ſpeciem quam ingerit ſenſibus aliud aliquid ex ſe faciens in cogitationem venire.

A ſign *Auſtin* hath long ſince defined to be, *that which ſhewes it ſelf to the ſenſes, and ſomewhat more beſides it ſelf to the underſtanding*; and in other words, [a] *A ſign is a thing which brings to mens thoughts another thing, beſides that which it offers to the ſenſes.* As the Rain-bowe offers it ſelf to the eyes (we ſee the ſhape of it, and the colours in it) and brings the promiſe of God into our minds, that the Floud ſhall no more return to deſtroy the earth. It were an endleſs labour to undertake to lay down the ſeveral kinds of ſignes, with all their ſub-diviſions: I never ſaw ſuch a Scheme of them, but I have thought many more might

be

be added to them; yet those at least that are notable may be reduced to certayn heads. Some are naturall, some are prodigious, and some are signs by institution. Natural signs are those that of themselves, and of their own nature are apt to signifie somewhat beyond themselves; As smoke signifies fire, a Rainbowe showres, Paleness sickness, Teares trouble, and grief of mind; of these Christ speaks, *Matth.* 16.2,3. *When it is evening ye say, It will be fair weather, for the skie is red; and in the morning, It will be foul weather to day, for the skie is red and lowring.* Now these signes are sometimes (as signes so also) causes of the thing signified; As the Sun beames in the dawning are a sign, and also a cause of the day approaching. The interposition of the Moon between us and the Sun, and of the earth between the Sun and Moon (foreseen in their motions) are signs, and causes of Eclipses. Sometimes they are effects of the thing that they signifie; As smoke is the effect of fire, and paleness of diseases. Some are barely signs, and neither causes nor effects; as the colour of the skie is no cause of rain, but barely an indication that there are those watry vapours in the air that will dissolve themselves on the earth: They may be effects of that which is the cause of the thing signified, but not the effects of that which is a sign. The Rain-bowe is an effect of that which is a cause of rain; Here we might lay down some rules or observations.

Neque enim hujus generis quisquam enmeravit omnia, nascuntur enim nova pro hominum arbitrio. *Pulling. Decad. 5. Ser. 6.*

A distribution of signs.

Natural signs.

Rules for the right understanding of natural signs.

First, Remote causes (which have their effects at a great distance, so that many things may interpose themselves as remoraes, cannot be looked upon by any as signs. When that book of common-prayer was imposed by authority upon *Scotland*, upon counsel then over-much heeded; it might have been easily concluded upon, as a sign of troubles and dissensions in present there; But no rational man could then have made it a prognostick of all those tragical stirs, which in three Nations have already happened, and we yet know not upon the flame kindled what may follow: The spark then kindled, might in probability have been quenched. The Stars say our Stargazers, have their influence upon mens bodies, and by consequence indirectly upon the operations of their soules. Hereupon by the posture of the Stars at mens birth, they will conclude the trade of life in which men shall be employed, the Arts that they shall profess, the fortunes (as the world calls them) to which they shall be advanced.

Remote causes are not signs.

vanced, and the very laſt period of their dayes. But here ſo many things may interpoſe, that the childs Genius ſuppoſedly thus diſpoſed, cannot ſway all theſe things, Parents, friends, wayes of Education, thouſands of obſtacles, and diverſifications ſo intervene, that no judgement can be given. If more were granted then ever will be proved of the heavens influence on mens minds and bodies to incline, or diſpoſe them; yet that of the Wiſe man would utterly ſpoyle all Predictions, *Eccleſ.* 9. 11. *The race is not to the ſwift, nor the battel to the ſtrong, neither yet bread to the wiſe, nor yet riches to men of underſtanding, nor yet favour to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth to them all.*

Partial cauſes are no ſigns

Seeondly, Partial cauſes in nature cannot be looked upon as ſigns, but all muſt concurre that have any influence. This (if I do not miſ-remember) good Mr. *Perkins* doth ſet down in a ſimilitude to this purpoſe. The heat of an Hen ſitting upon Eggs is the cauſe of a brood of young ones; but ſuppoſe an Hen ſhould ſit on Eggs of divers kinds, ſome of a Dove, ſome of a Partridge, ſome of a Pheſant, ſome of a Hawk, ſome of a Kite; who could now from the heat of the Hen, give his judgement of what kind, the birds ſhould be, that this heat would hatch? would they not be different in kind according to the variety of ſubjects that this heat works upon? If we ſee flint before us, this is no ſign of fire to be kindled, unleſs we ſee ſteele with it; nor yet flint and ſteele without tinder; nor yet flint, ſteele and tinder, without a hand employed to ſtrike fire: all put together make up a ſign, and not otherwiſe. To apply this to our purpoſe.

Firſt, Let it be granted, that the heavens have their operations on mens bodies on earth, no otherwiſe then the heat of the Hen hath for procreation of ſuch a kind, or the flint to the working of fire, yet the heavens have their influence upon divers, and diverſified objects: not diverſified by their influence only, but done to their hands, we derive our being from Parents, not onely in our eſſentials, and integrals, but in a great meaſure in our temperature of body and mind. Who ſees not vertues and defects of body and mind to be hereditary, and that from either ſex, Children do *patrizare*, follow their Parents inclination without any imitation? now the heavens were not in the ſame poſture, *Mars*, *Jupiter*, *&c.* were not in the ſame aſcendent, in their

their birth as in ours. A begger is delivered under the same posture of the heavens with a Noble-woman, shall the children of both be of the same trade and way?

Secondly, If the Stars and their influences were universal causes of what is done in, and shall befall our persons, yet these men profess acquaintance onely with some few, and those almost onely the Planets; The Stars of an unfixt motion. Those innumerable Stars, which we call fixt, and have been said to be in the eighth (which we call the starry) sphere, are not observed nor known in their various postures, what some may incline to, others will thwart and destroy.

For a third rule, those signs which fairly may be looked upon as causes in nature, have their effects, and produce the thing signified unavoydable, irresistible; so that is a labour in vain to use any wayes, a tempting of God to make any addresses to him for prevention; who ever prayed that the day and night should not be of an equal length, at such a day in the Spring and Autumne, which are known to us by the name of the æquinoctial; or, that the Sun shall not be eclipsed at such a time when it is known that the body of the Moon will interpose it self in that season? If the heavens are alike causes of mans vicious wayes, & of the ruine and bane of Nations, endeavours for prevention will be equally vain; whether it be by prayer, or repentance. He that cannot make the Sun to stand still, or to return backwards by prayer, let him not think to stand in the gap for a land, or turn away Gods fiery indignation, seeing the course of nature appointed of God, brings it about above resistance. I have heard of some *Rabbins* that pray every night that the Sun may rise again, and the earth enjoy a new morning, as though it were no otherwise in nature by the God of nature ordered, and setled, but it lay in them to hinder it; but Christians have learned better, then to think by their prayers to impose a new course on the way of nature. And knowing that prayer and repentance are wayes appointed of God, and by experience succesfull for reversal of judgements, and prevention of National desolations, they know that Stars in a way of nature cannot effect it, nor yet the sons or disciples of nature foresee or foretell it.

Natural signs when causes unlesse an extraordinary power interveine work unavoydably.

2. *Prodigious signe.*

Secondly, There are prodigious signes, such that are, either miraculous, exceeding all power of nature; or else wounds and mon-

monsters in nature; And I know not the reason why *Chamier*, *lib.* 1. *Cap.* 11. *de Sacramentis in genere*, should exclude them from the number of signes; certainly the return of the Sun in *Hezekiahs* time, was to him a sign of his recovery from sickneſſe, and of his deliverance from the *Aſſyrian*, *Iſay* 38. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. *Thus ſaith the Lord, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have ſeen thy tears, behold, I will adde unto thy daies, fifteen yeares; And I will deliver thee and this City out of the hand of the king of Aſſyria, and I will defend this City; And this ſhall be a ſign unto thee from the Lord, that the Lord will do this thing, that he hath ſpoken; Behold, I will bring again the ſhadow of the degrees which is gone down in the ſun-dyal of Ahaz, ten degrees backward.* The like may be ſaid of *Gideons* fleece, that had dew on it when all the earth was dry beſides; and again the fleece dry when upon all the ground elſe it was dew; This was to ſignifie that the Lord would deliver *Iſrael* by his hand; Thoſe eclipſes of the lights of heaven to the *Egyptians* when there was light in *Goſhen* to the *Iſraelites*, *Exod.* 10. 21, 22. and at Chriſts death, when from the ſixth houre there was darkneſſe over all the earth unto the ninth houre, *Matth.* 27. 45. was no other. *I will ſhew wonders in the heavens, and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of ſmoke, the Sun ſhall be turned into darkneſſe, and the Moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord*, Joel 2. 30, 31. *There ſhall be ſigns in the Sun, and in the Moon, and in the Stars, and upon the earth diſtreſſe of Nations, and perplexity, the ſea and the waves roaring, mens hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after thoſe things which are coming upon the earth, for the powers of heaven ſhall be ſhaken*, which *Zanchius* underſtands of thoſe Comets, which as wonders in nature, in ſeverall ages have appeared. He that pleaſes may conſult the Author himſelf treating *de Cometarum prognoſticis, lib.* 3. *de operibus Dei, Cap.* 2. *Theſ.* 12.

Signes by Inſtitution.

Thirdly, There are ſignes by inſtitution: not ſo in nature, or by way of prodigy, but as they are deſigned to ſignify: Theſe are, 1. Of man, ſome by impoſition, man putting at pleaſure ſuch a ſignification upon them; words in this ſenſe are ſignes; no other reaſon of primitive names of things can be given, but his pleaſure that gave them; Some by cuſtome, as an Ivy buſh is a ſign of wine; Sometimes by covenant, or agreement, ſo the arrowes that *Jonathan* ſhot, with the words that he agreed to utter, were a ſign to *David* that there was peace, or that there was harm

intended

intended to him, 1 *Sam.* 20. 20, &c. So the Scarlet thred was a sign between *Rahab* and the spies, *Joshua* 2. 18. A Souldiers Colours, or the word that is given on his guard, or in fight is such a sign. 2. There are signes by institution from God, such was the rainebowe; It may be a naturall sign of showers; but it is by institution, that it signifies, that there shall not be any more a flood to destroy the earth, *Gen.* 9. 11. These instituted signes, whether of God, or man, admit of other distinctions, which will be touched upon in the next place, in opening the nature, and shewing the properties of Sacramentall signes. There are signes of a fourth sort which might have been spoken to, namely those that are Diabolicall or superstitious; But I shall not trouble my self or the Reader with them.

SECT. II.

The properties of Sacramental signes.

Sacramentall signes are,

1. *External and sensible.*

FIrst, Sacramental signes are externall, and sensible, such that do not immediately, but by the help of the senses, affect the understanding. There are indeed such signes that immediately offer themselves to the mind, which some call mentall, or intellectuall Signes; These are either notions framed in the understanding, or actions that are past, and called into the thoughts, *Matth.* 12. 39. *An evill and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the Prophet Jonas.* Though some Popish Writers have affirmed, that this sensibility of the outward signes, is not of the essence of the Sacraments; seeing God might if he had pleased have instituted Sacraments with signes meerly spirituall, yet they are disliked in this by their own party; and themselves also confesse, that the signes that God hath instituted, are external and sensible; and we enquire not after such as God might have given, had he pleased; but such that he hath pleased to give to his people.

2. *Visible.*

Secondly, They are visible signes. It is not enough that they are the objects of other senses, as such that may be heard, felt, tasted; but Sacramentall signes must be the object of sight;

This is cleer by the induction of particulars. The foreskin in Circumcision, the lamb in the Passeover, water in Baptisme, bread and wine in the Lords Supper, with all the actions of each of these are visible; And thus a Sacrament by the Ancients hath still been defined, An outward and visible sign of an inward and Spirituall grace, which hath never been excepted against as unsound; but only as insufficient. It is too short, but in no part erroneous. And *Austin, lib.* 19. *Contra Faust. Cap.* 25. as he is quoted by *Bellarmine*, demands, what are all corporall Sacraments, but certain visible words? Other senses may accompany the sight, but nothing can be a Sacramentall sign that excludes the sight, nothing that is not in nature visible. And therefore sounds or words, are no Sacramental signes, which being no object of sight, nor of any other sense, but of that of hearing, they are not in any such capacity. Here a man might think that *Bellarmine* and we were agreed, Seeing he so often gives Sacramentall signes that Epithete of visible; and, *lib.* 1. *de Sacramen. Cap.* 18. putting it to the question, whether Sacraments consist of things as their matter, and words as their forme? he determines affirmatively, and laies this down for his second proposition, that, [b] *In all Sacraments of the New Testament, things are found as the matter, and wordes as the forme*, and none can doubt but things put in opposition to words as the matter of Sacraments are visible. But he hath his art to come off by distinction, or rather contradiction. To the first he saies, that [c] *Catholiques take the word visible, and tractable element, for any thing that is any way sensible*, that may be perceived by the eare, and not for that onely, which by the sight and touch onely can be perceived, *lib.* 1. *de Sacramentis in genere, Cap.* 14. And so a sound will make up his visible, and tractable sign, which is of necessity in Sacraments; And he can explain that second proposition with a fourth, which is, [*] *That Sacraments may be said to consist of things and words, but it is not necessary that things be not words, nor words be not things; But it is enough that somewhat supply the place of thinges or words, Cap.* 18. And all this wild stuffe, which scarce I think can be parallelled in the most unlearned Writer, to make it good that their Penance and Marriage are Sacraments; in both which we must take words (which he saies are the form of those Sacraments) for visible signes, which also constitute the matter of them, or else we have no visible sign at all, and consequently no Sacrament. Some here question the case

[b] In Sacramentis omnibus novæ legis inveniuntur res ut materia, & verba ut forma.

[c] Prima particula, vel accipit elementum visibile & tractabile, pro qualibet re sensibili, ut accipiant Catholicic &,

[*] Ut Sacramenta constare dicantur rebus, & verbis, non est necesse, ut res non sint verba, & verba non sint res, sed sat est, si aliquid fungatur vice rei, aliud vice verbi.

case of blind people, by whom no sign can be seen; but it is one thing to be visible, and the proper object of sight, and another thing to be actually seen visible and *visum differre* one from another; It is in it self visible, though through defect in the organ, it is not seen of some. Such are at a losse in receiving, though not equall to the losse of deaf people in the Word, which is to be heard, seeing when the Word is not heard, it affects no other of the senses; but when bread and wine are not seen they are touched, and tasted; and where blindnesse is not from the birth, there is some supply from the memory likewise

3. *Analogicall.*

Thirdly, they are Analogicall signes, such as carry Analogy and proportion with the thing signified; they have ever an aptnesse in them for resemblance. That of *Austin* is famous, *If* [d] *Sacraments carry no resemblance of the things whereof they are Sacraments, they are no Sacraments at all.* *Gerrard de Sacramentis, Cap. 3. Sect. 3.* in the name of the *Lutherane* party doth confesse [e] *that there is such Analogy in Sacraments,* but he saith, *that this Analogy in the Sacraments of the New Testament, is but the secondary office of it. The primary and chief office is to be a medium or vehicalum, a means for exhibition of the grace of the Sacrament to the person*; But gives us no reason. And *Suarez* (as *Chamier* observes) denyes this Analogy between sign and thing signified to be necessary, yet confesses that in all Sacraments there is such Analogy found; But, as *Chamier* demands, how shall an universall necessity be concluded, but by particular experiments? and what is found in every one, we conclude to be of necessity in all; finding upon observation this Analogy in every Sacrament, we conclude it necessary in all Sacraments. There are some signs have their signification wholly from their institution, and of themselves carry no proportion. As the sound of a trumpet which is the sign of a troop of horse, the sound of a Bell which is the sign of an Assembly, whether for civill, or for sacred things; An Ivy bush the sign of wine to be sold. There are other signes that of themselves declare their own signification, as the print of the foot on the ground whether of horse or man, is a sign of the foot that made the impression; A shadow is a sign of a body that darkens the place neer to it.

Distribution of Analogicall signes.

[d] Si enim Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sunt Sacramenta, non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent.

[e] Non negamus signa Sacramentalia ἀναλογίαν quandam cum fructu Sacramenti habere. Sed analogia illa significativa est secundarium rei terrenæ sive elementi in Sacramentis Novi T. officium; primarium officium est ut sit τὸ ὄχημα, vehiculum & medium per quod res cœlestis exhibetur,

There are a third sort of signes of a middle nature, that have their resemblance of the thing signified, but in that indeterminate confused manner, that they may rather be said to be fit to signifie that whereof they are signes, then that of themselves without further declaration added they do signifie. And such are the signes in Sacraments, as *Thomas Aquinas* observes, *part.* 3. *quæst.* 60. *artic.* 6. and after him *Bellarmine lib.* 1. *de Sacramentis in genere*; and *Chamier* gives his assent to both, *lib.* 1. *de Sacramentis in genere, Cap.* 11. Water hath a faculty to wash, as also to refresh, and cool; when water is set apart for Baptisme, though there be a fitnesse in it to signifie washing; yet there must be a word to explain that it is to signifie washing, and with it the thing that is cleansed.

4. *Ritual.*

Fourthly, They are not barely substantial signes, but rituall also. The outward elements do not barely signifie, but the instituted actions likewise are significant. In Circumcision the foreskin alone was not a sign, but the cutting of it off, in the way appointed of God, seemes the chief in signification. In the Passeover there is not onely a lamb, but rosting, eating, &c. all which are significant. In Baptisme there is not onely water, but the application of the person to the water in dipping, or the water to the person by infusion, or sprinkling. The word in Scripture use comprizes any washing; and therefore in Baptisme it is of it self indifferent. In the Lords Supper there is not onely bread and wine, but the bread is broke, the bread and cup delivered, receiving, eating, and drinking. Some indeed question, whether the breaking of the bread be any Sacramental rite; or at all of the integrality of the Sacrament? but all confesse that in case it be within an institution, it is then necessary. About the beginning of the reformation, some that stood for the ejection of Ceremonies, pleaded for sitting at the Lords Supper, as an instituted Sacramental rite, signifying our coheiresship with Christ; But others that in after times did manage the same cause, saw that mistake, and therefore urged not the necessity of sitting upon that account, but onely did except against kneeling, either as Idolatrous, or carrying too great an appearance of it.

5. *Distinguishing.*

Fifthly, They are distinguishing and differencing signes, separating a people that receive them, from all others that are not interessed in them; so they have the nature of badges, or cognizances; *Calvin* justly rejects those that make the Sacraments no

more

more but bare testimonies of our profession, or distinguishing marks. That as a *Roman* was known by his gown from a *Grecian* in his cloke; and in *Rome* the several orders had their distinctions. The Senatour was distinguished from the Knight by his Purple, and the Knight from one of the Commonalty by his ring; as with us a Knight of the Garter is distinguished by his blue Ribband, and a Knight of the Bath by the red; yet they cannot be denyed, but that they have this distinguishing use. By these Sacramental signes the people of God are known from others, which is herein plain, in that they are signes of the Covenant, and by an usual metonomy called by the name of the Covenant, *Gen.*17.20. *Act.* 7.8. And therefore distinguished those that received them from all that are out of Covenant. So Circumcision distinguished a *Jew* from all others. A man in uncircumcision was an heathen. Circumcision in the flesh did denominate a *Jew* outwardly, as Circumcision of the heart (which is that to which Circumcision in the letter did engage) did denominate a man a *Jew* inwardly. That which Circumcision was in this respect, Baptisme is: As soon as any joyned himself to *Abrahams* family, and afterwards to the seed of *Abraham* in Covenant, he was to be circumcised, *Gen.*17.13. *Exod.*12.48. None were to be as one born in the land, but a circumcised man. As soon as any joyned himself to the body and society of Christians, he was baptized, so was Christs Commission, *Disciple all Nations, baptizing them.* No sooner was *Paul*, the *Eunuch*, the *Jaylour*, Lydia, yea, *Simon Magus* made disciples, but they were forthwith baptized. The Passeover as well as Circumcision, the Lords Supper, as well as Baptisme are distinguishing signes. But these find men beforehand distinguished. The preceding Sacraments whereby men are initiated, and first enrolled, are more properly distinguishing.

6. *Congregating.*

Sixthly, They are congregating, uniting and closing signes; this may seem contradictory to the former, which makes them distinguishing, and differencing. To unite and difference are evidently contrary, but these well enough agree, the contradiction being not *ad idem*. They are not the same that they unite and difference; They distinguish men in Covenant from strangers, and they unite men in Covenant as one among themselves. A Souldiers Colours difference him from all other companies, and unite him to those of that body into which he is received. As Philosophers say of heat, that it doth *congregare homogenea*, and

and *dissipare heterogenea*, gather together those things that are of a like, and separate those that are of a different quality; so it is with Sacraments. This the Apostle takes for granted, 1 *Cor.* 10.16,17,18,19,20,21. His business there is to take Christians off from joyning with heathens in their Idol-sacrifices, because such joyning makes them one body with those Idolaters. Which is clear in the 19, 20, 21. v. *What say I then? that the Idol is any thing? or that which is offered in sacrifice to Idols is any thing? but I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with Devils; ye cannot drink of the Cup of the Lord, and of the Cup of Devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lords Table, and of the table of Devils.* And this he had also argued against, Chap. 8. Vers. 10. And he proves that this makes them one Idolatrous body with Gentiles, in their sacrifices to Devls, by way of an analogy with Christian and Jewish worship. Because joyning in the Lords Supper to partake of one bread, makes men one body Christian, and partaking with Jewes after the flesh, eating of their sacrifices, made partakers of the Altar of the Jewes and one body Jewish, vers. 17,18. therefore joyning with heathens in their worship makes one body heathenish. A text which some weakly enough have brought against mixt communions, to prove, that none must joyn with a bad man in a Christian Sacrament, when it onely serves to prove that Christians may not joyn with Idolaters in the Devils Sacraments. They difference us from all those that want, and joyne us unto all those that enjoy these badges of a Christian profession.

7. *Engaging.*

Seventhly, They are engaging signes to answer the profession that we make, the company or family to which we relate; The name that we bear, and to do the duty that we owe. What the name of Christian, or servant, or people of God speaks, the same these signs call for, As the Altar set up, *Josh.* 22.24. did witness, that those two Tribes and a half did belong with the other Tribes to the God of *Israel*; so these Sacramental signes witness the same thing likewise.

8. *Remembrancing.*

Eighthly, They ace remonstrative, and remembrancing signes; sometimes of mercy conferred: The Passeover was a sign of *Israels* freedom out of the land of *Egypt*, *Exod.* 12. 26, 27. The Lords Supper shewes forth the Lords death untill he come, 1 *Cor.* 11.26. being appointed to be done in remembrance

of

of Chriſt, *Matth.*26.26. *Mar.* 14,20. *Luk.*22.29. 1 *Cor.*11. 24. of Chriſt dying, giving his body and blood for us. As thoſe twelve ſtones taken out of Jordan by twelve men, out of every Tribe a man, were for a ſign in ages following, a memorial unto the children of *Iſrael* for ever, that the waters of Jordan were cut off before the Arke of the Covenant of the Lord, when it paſſed over Jordan, *Joſh.*4.6,7. So theſe Sacramental ſigns are memorials of the mercy mentioned: They are alwayes memorials of the Covenant that we have entred, the duty in which we ſtand engaged. The Apoſtle having ſhewed, that Baptiſme doth ſignifie a death to ſin, and a life in righteouſneſs, *Rom.*6.4. preſently thence gives warning, he that is dead is free from ſin, verſ.6.

Ninethly, I might ſhew that they are ratifying and confirming ſignes, but this is diſtinctly mentioned. They are ſeals as well as ſignes which remaines to be handled. 9, *Ratifying.*

SECT. III.

Corollaries from the former Doctrine.

SEveral conſectaries follow from this obſervation, which containes one part of the definition of a Sacrament.

Firſt, That the ſign and the thing ſignified in every Sacrament are one, not properly and really one, but in that manner one; as all thoſe things that remain diſtinct in nature one from other, yet bear proportion and reſemblance one with other are one; One, as Chriſt and a door, Chriſt and a vine are one; They are ſo one, that one may be ſaid to be the other; when yet one diſtinct thing from other cannot be ſaid to be the other in a ſenſe that is proper, my hand is not my writing, my writing is not my hand, but my hand is that which writes, and writing is written with my hand; and ſo my writing is uſually called my hand: and theſe ſpeeches are in all mouthes vulgar, & common; and are ſo far from being hard to underſtand, that indeed they help the underſtanding. A woman ſhewes a written peece of parchment, and ſayes, Here is my Dower or Joynture; when Dower, or Joynture is in Lands, not in Papers. Every *The ſign and thing ſignified are analogically one.*

one knows, that this ſpeech means, that it is that, which veſts her in it; we ſhew a paper, and ſay, This is my will, not meaning that faculty of the ſoul it ſelf, but a manifeſtation of what our deſire is ſhould be done with our eſtate after our deceaſe; ſuch a man lives on my trencher, that is, on the meat which is laid on the trencher at my table; ſo that men ſhould bleſſe God for that he condeſcends to ſpeak in ſuch perſpicuity, and not complain in ſuch ſpeeches of difficulty. Upon account of this oneneſs between the ſign and the thing ſignified, ſometimes the ſign is ſaid to be the thing ſignified, as that Bread is the body of Chriſt, and the Cup the blood of Chriſt, *Matth.*26.26,27. So that that of *Auſtin* is famous, *that Chriſt ſaid, This is my body, when he gave the ſign of his body.* Circumciſion is called the Covenant, *Gen.*17.9,10,11. *Act.*7.8. The Lambe is called the Paſſeover, *Exod.*12.11,21. *Matth.*26.28. And the trees before ſpoken to, are called the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil; ſee *Ezek.*5.5. 1 *Cor.*10.4. In all of theſe places, the ſigne hath the name of the thing ſignified; by reaſon of Analogy and repreſentation, and all by inſtitution: ſometimes on the other hand, the thing ſignified is called by the name of, and is ſaid to be the ſign, as, 1 *Cor.*5.7. Chriſt our Paſſeover is ſacrificed for us; ſo, *Joh.*6.55. My fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed; fitly reſembled by meat and drink. *Joh.*15.1. I am the true vine, fitly reſembled by a vine, ſee *Joh.*10.10,11. Sometimes the effect which the thing ſignified doth produce, is called by the name of the ſign, ſo in that ſpeech of *Ananias* related by *Paul*, *Act.*22.16. *Ariſe, and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the Name of the Lord*; when it was not the water that he was then to uſe, but the blood of Chriſt, that could take away ſin, 1 *Joh.*1.7. ſo Baptiſme ſaves, 1 *Pet.*3.21. when as the Apoſtle there (as may be further ſhewen) explains his own meaning: ſo the putting off the ſins of the fleſh, is called by the name of Circumciſion, and of Baptiſme, *Coloſ.*2.11,12. Sometimes that which is the proper work of the ſign, is attributed to the thing ſignified, *Deut.* 10.16. *Circumciſe therefore the foreſkin of your heart, and be not ſtiffe necked.* Theſe, and ſuch like ſpeeches as theſe, would be familiar with us, and we ſhould be able to give an account of them, in caſe we underſtood Sacramental relations, and other reſemblances frequent in Scriptures.

Secondly, Then it further followes, that there can be no such thing as transubstantiation: The sign and the thing signified remain distinct, and cannot properly be the same in any Sacraments. Of all Scripture-Sacraments, and all those additional forged Sacraments of the Church of *Rome*, one onely is by them thus honoured. The Paschal Lambe was not turned into the body of Christ, nor is water turned into the blood of Christ in Baptisme; Nor do any other of their supposed signes lose their nature, onely in the Lords Supper bread is not bread, (though it be still called bread) but flesh; wine is not wine, (though called the fruit of the vine) but blood; we see bread, we taste bread, we handle bread; and yet we must not give credit either to our eyes, ears, taste, or touch, but we must believe it is no bread. It hath the natural properties of bread and wine; it gives natural nourishment as bread and wine; the bread, if eaten in excesse, and the wine drunken will cause surfeit, and intoxicate as bread and wine. As the natural force, so the natural defects of bread and wine, still remain after consecration. The bread breeds wormes, and the wine turnes to vineger; yet we must believe. that God by miracle hath taken away bread and wine, given blood and flesh, turned bread into flesh, wine into blood, and yet still by miracles keeps up the natural shape, properties and defects of these outward Elements. When God in Scripture wrought miracles, the miracles were seen and known. There have been transubstantiations, but those were never hidden; *Moses* his rod was turned into a Serpent, and it was seen to be a Serpent; so that *Moses* on sight fled from it, *Exod.* 4. 3. It was turned again into a rod, and known to be a rod, vers. 4. Christ turnes water into wine. *Joh.* 2. 9. that was not judged to be still water, or called by that name, but by the taste known to be of the most precious wine, vers. 10. But our senses having thus deceived us, and made us believe that there is still bread and wine, when by miracle bread and wine is gone, where shall we find any Word to ground our faith to believe this delusion? The words of the institution or nothing must carry it.

There is no such thing as transubstantiation.

This is my body, this Cup is my blood in the New Testament: But such an interpretation, 1. Destroyes the outward sign, and makes it no Sacrament. 2. Makes the speech wholly not Sacramental. No Sacramental speech can be proper, and we have

enough from our adverſaries to excuſe our faith from the acknowledgement of any ſuch a change. If we look no further then three teſtimonies quoted by learned Mr. *Gataker*, from three Romiſh Cardinals in his diſcourſe of tranſubſtantiation, Pag.2.3. Cardinal *Bellarmine* (*ſaith he*) *granteth that theſe words, This is my body, may imply either ſuch a real change of the bread as the Catholiques hold, or ſuch a figurative change as the Calviniſts hold; but will not bear that ſenſe that the Lutherans give it. And Cardinal Cajetan acknowledgeth, and freely confeſſeth, that there appeareth not any thing out of the Goſpel that may enforce us to underſtand thoſe words, This is my body properly. And he addeth, that nothing in the text hindreth, but that thoſe words may as well be taken in a metaphorical ſenſe, as thoſe words of the Apoſtle, the Rock was Chriſt; and that the words of either propoſition may well be true, though the thing there ſpoken be not underſtood in a proper ſenſe, but in a metaphorical ſenſe onely.* And he further ſaith, *he finds alleadged out of Biſhop Fiſher* (*whom Bellar. lib. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* Pag.209. makes both a Cardinal, and a Martyr) that *there is not one word in St. Matthewes Goſpel from which the true preſence of Chriſts fleſh and blood in our Maſſe may be proved; out of Scripture it cannot be proved.*

And being traduced for this quotation by an adverſary, as taking it out of a nameleſs Author, ignorant, and unſincere in his aſſertions; In his defence of the ſaid diſcourſe, Pag. 44. he tells his adverſary, that his Author whom he thus brands, as ignorant and unſincere, is *Biſhop Andrewes*, in his anſwer to the Apology of *Card. Bellar.* againſt King *James* his admonitory preface, Chap.1. and I find *Muſculus* in his common places *de Cœna Domin.* Pag.365. quoting the ſame words out of the ſame Author, and much more to the ſame purpoſe.——He that would be further furniſhed againſt this monſter of tranſubſtantiation, in our own language; let him read the fore-mentioned diſcourſe of Mr. *Gatakers*, together with the defence, as alſo Biſhop *Mortons* his Treatiſe divided into eight parts of the inſtitution of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Chriſt.

Gods goodneſſe ſeen in his condeſcenſion to our weakneſſe.

Thirdly, We may ſee the goodneſs of God, in this way of condeſcenſion by earthly things, carnal, ſenſible, and ſuitable to our natures, to help our underſtandings, and ſtrengthen our faith in things heavenly. If we were meer incorporeal

ſubſtances,

substances, and had spirits not shut up, and imprisoned in bodies, then (saith *Chrysostome*) we should have had spirituall things in an answerable way, nakedly in themselves held out unto us; then Parables had not been used, nor similitudes borrowed, nor Sacramental signs instituted. But having souls affixt to bodies, that which our spirits should learn, these things of earth are imployed of God to teach; God looked not at himself, when he chose this method, It is farre below him to fill up his sacred Oracles with these things, but at our imbecillity. In case he should speak as God, that is, in a language answering the Majestie of God, we must be as gods to comprehend his words, and understand his speech; but dealing with us that have bodies made up of earth, and minds over eagerly addicted to earth, he is pleased in his transactions not to deal (if I may so say) as God, but as with man, seeking glory onely in manifestation of his goodness, and tender regard of our weakness. Christ saw a necessity of this way of dealing, not onely as God, by his omniscience, but as man, by his practical experience. He taught *Nicodemus* the nature of regeneration by similitudes borrowed from water, and from the wind, *Except a man be borne of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou heares the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; So is every one that is born of the Spirit.* Joh. 3. 5, 8. Notwithstanding all this endeavour of Christ to cleare this truth, *Nicodemus* still remaines ignorant, he answers and saies to Christ, *How can these things be?* Christ after a sharp reproof, ver. 10. (*Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?* not onely a Scholar, but a Teacher, and that not in any place of darkness, but in *Israel* that valley of vision) addes, ver. 12. *If I have told you earthly things, and ye beleeve not, how shall ye beleeve if I tell you of heavenly things?* Christ had not read a Lecture to *Nicodemus* of the water, or of the wind, neither had *Nicodemus* questioned either of those assertions, *The wind bloweth where it listeth, thou knowest not whence it comes, nor whither it goes*; that he should on this account charge *Nicodemus* with not beleeving doctrine of this kind; But the meaning is, If I speak of regeneration by earthly similitudes, and expressions, obvious to the senses, and you are not able to apprehend, and understand them; how then if I speak to you of heavenly things in an heavenly manner, without any such sensible repre-

sentation

enough from out adverſaries to excuſe our faith from the acknowledgement of any ſuch a change. If we look no further then three teſtimonies quoted by learned Mr. *Gataker*, from three Romiſh Cardinals in his diſcourſe of tranſubſtantiation, Pag.2.3. Cardinal *Bellarmine (ſaith he) granteth that theſe words, This is my body, may imply either ſuch a real change of the bread as the Catholiques hold, or ſuch a figurative change as the Calviniſts hold; but will not bear that ſenſe that the Lutherans give it. And Cardinal Cajetan acknowledgeth, and freely confeſſeth, that there appeareth not any thing out of the Goſpel that may enforce us to underſtand thoſe words, This is my body properly. And he addeth, that nothing in the text hindreth, but that thoſe words may as well be taken in a metaphorical ſenſe, as thoſe words of the Apoſtle, the Rock was Chriſt; and that the words of either propoſition may well be true, though the thing there ſpoken be not underſtood in a proper ſenſe, but in a metaphorical ſenſe onely.* And he further ſaith, *he finds alleadged out of Biſhop Fiſher (whom Bellar. lib. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt. Pag.209. makes both a Cardinal, and a Martyr) that there is not one word in St. Matthewes Goſpel from which the true preſence of Chriſts fleſh and blood in our Maſſe may be proved; out of Scripture it cannot be proved.*

And being traduced for this quotation by an adverſary, as taking it out of a nameleſs Author, ignorant, and unſincere in his aſſertions; In his defence of the ſaid diſcourſe, Pag. 44. he tells his adverſary, that his Author whom he thus brands, as ignorant and unſincere, is *Biſhop Andrewes*, in his anſwer to the Apology of *Card. Bellar.* againſt King *James* his admonitory preface, Chap.1. and I find *Muſculus* in his common places *de Cœna Domin.* Pag.365. quoting the ſame words out of the ſame Author, and much more to the ſame purpoſe.——He that would be further furniſhed againſt this monſter of tranſubſtantiation, in our own language; let him read the fore-mentioned diſcourſe of Mr. *Gatakers*, together with the defence, as alſo Biſhop *Mortons* his Treatiſe divided into eight parts of the inſtitution of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Chriſt.

Gods goodneſſe ſeen in his condeſcenſion to our weakneſſe.

Thirdly, We may ſee the goodneſs of God, in this way of condeſcenſion by earthly things, carnal, ſenſible, and ſuitable to our natures, to help our underſtandings, and ſtrengthen our faith in things heavenly. If we were meer incorporeal

ſubſtances,

ſubſtances, and had ſpirits not ſhut up, and impriſoned in bodies, then (ſaith *Chryſoſtome*) we ſhould have had ſpirituall things in an anſwerable way, nakedly in themſelves held out unto us; then Parables had not been uſed, nor ſimilitudes borrowed, nor Sacramental ſigns inſtituted. But having ſouls affixt to bodies, that which our ſpirits ſhould learn, theſe things of earth are imployed of God to teach; God looked not at himſelf, when he choſe this method, It is farre below him to fill up his ſacred Oracles with theſe things, but at our imbecillity. In caſe he ſhould ſpeak as God, that is, in a language anſwering the Majeſtie of God, we muſt be as gods to comprehend his words, and underſtand his ſpeech; but dealing with us that have bodies made up of earth, and minds over eagerly addicted to earth, he is pleaſed in his tranſactions not to deal (if I may ſo ſay) as God, but as with man, ſeeking glory onely in manifeſtation of his goodneſs, and tender regard of our weakneſs. Chriſt ſaw a neceſſity of this way of dealing, not onely as God, by his omniſcience, but as man, by his practical experience. He taught *Nicodemus* the nature of regeneration by ſimilitudes borrowed from water, and from the wind, *Except a man be borne of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God. The wind bloweth where it liſteth, and thou heareſt the ſound thereof, but canſt not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; So is every one that is born of the Spirit.* Joh. 3. 5, 8. Notwithſtanding all this endeavour of Chriſt to cleare this truth, *Nicodemus* ſtill remaines ignorant, he anſwers and ſaies to Chriſt, *How can theſe things be?* Chriſt after a ſharp reproof, ver. 10. (*Art thou a maſter in Iſrael, and knoweſt not theſe things?* not onely a Scholar, but a Teacher, and that not in any place of darkneſſe, but in *Iſrael* that valley of viſion) addes, ver. 12. *If I have told you earthly things, and ye beleeve not, how ſhall ye beleeve if I tell you of heavenly things?* Chriſt had not read a Lecture to *Nicodemus* of the water, or of the wind, neither had *Nicodemus* queſtioned either of thoſe aſſertions, *The wind bloweth where it liſteth, thou knoweſt not whence it comes, nor whither it goes*; that he ſhould on this account charge *Nicodemus* with not beleeving doctrine of this kind; But the meaning is, If I ſpeak of regeneration by earthly ſimilitudes, and expreſſions, obvious to the ſenſes, and you are not able to apprehend, and underſtand them; how then if I ſpeak to you of heavenly things in an heavenly manner, without any ſuch ſenſible repreſentation

ſentation at all, would you then underſtand? This interpretation of theſe words *Maldonate* doth give, notwithſtanding *Bullinger*, *Decad.* 5. *Ser.* 6. had gone before him in it. *Ravanellus* in his *Theſaurus*, and *Mr. Burges* in his *Ser.* 35. *pag.* 211. give the ſame. In which we ſee our need of help this way, and the ſingular condeſcenſion of Chriſt Jeſus in dealing this way for our help, which place in my thoughts ſerves to cleere that ſpeech of the Evangeliſt, *Mar.* 4. 33. *And with many ſuch parables ſpake he the word unto them, as they were able to beare it*; many are there reckoned up, and more by *Matthew*, Matth. 13. many more perhaps were uttered, then either *Matthew* or *Mark* relate; *as they were able to bear*, ſaith the text, *according to their capacities*, ſay the larger Annotations. And ſo *Janſenius* upon the words, [f] *Hereby he ſignifies that Chriſt would fit his ſpeech to the capacity of the hearers, becauſe they were not capable of naked truthes, and he borrowed his ſpeeches from vulgar things, by which the moſt unlearned might be fitted for the myſteries of the kingdome of heaven.* Though ſome underſtand the words as they were worthy to hear, and not to underſtand, parables being above the common capacities, and put for hard and difficult ſpeeches; As, *Matth.* 13. 10. Chriſt being demanded, Why ſpeakeſt thou in parables? he anſwers, ver. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. *Becauſe it is given unto you to know the myſteries of the Kingdome of heaven, but to them it is not given: for whoſoever hath, to him it ſhall be given, and he ſhall have more abundance: but whoſoever hath not, from him ſhall be taken away, even that he hath. Therefore ſpeake I to them in parables, becauſe they ſeeing ſee not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they underſtand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Iſaiah which ſaith, By hearing ye ſhall hear, and not underſtand, and ſeeing ye ſhall ſee, and not perceive: For this peoples heart is waxed groſſe, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have cloſed, leſt at any time they ſhould ſee with their eyes, and hear with their eares, and ſhould underſtand with their heart, and ſhould be converted, and I ſhould heal them. But bleſſed are your eyes, for they ſee; and your eares, for they heare.* But theſe texts may be reconciled; A parable or Similitude, when men ſtay in the outward bark of it, is as a riddle, nothing can be more obſcure; Some myſtery men know is hid under it, but they know not what. Therefore Chriſt having uttered a parable to the multitude, *Matth.* 15. 11. and *Peter* requeſting, *Declare unto us this parable*, ver. 15. ſaith, *Are ye alſo yet without underſtanding?* Parables explained are the plaineſt way of teaching,

[f] Quo ſignificat Dominum voluiſſe aptare ſuum ſermonem ad captum auditorum, & ob id locutum in parabolis, quod nudi ſermonis nondum eſſent capaces; at parabolas ſuas deſumſiſſe a rebus vulgaribus, per quas idiotæ utcunque induci & parari poſſunt ad myſteriorum captum.

ching, ſhewing the face of heavenly things in earthly glaſſes; and therefore the Lord to ſet out his dealing with his own people ſaith, *I have alſo ſpoken by the Prophets, and I have multiplyed viſions, and uſed ſimilitudes by the Miniſtery of the Prophets*, Hoſ. 12. 10. But the ſcope being not diſcerned, onely that which is ſaid of earthly things, and no more is known. Now what words are to the eares in ſimilitudes and compariſons, that Sacramentall ſignes are to the eyes; by both the underſtanding is holpen, the memory refreſht, and as may (God willing) be unfolded, faith ſtrengthened. The cleanſing from ſin, we find in Scripture held forth under the metaphor of pouring out water, *Ezek.* 36. 25. *Then will I ſprinkle clean water upon you, and ye ſhall be clean from all your filthineſſe, and from all your Idols will I cleanſe you.* To which the Apoſtle alludes, *Epheſ.* 5. 26. where he ſaith, *Chriſt loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it, that he might ſanctifie and cleanſe it by the waſhing of water, by the word.* Which was typified alſo in thoſe divers waſhings mentioned by the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9. 10. which the blood of Chriſt doth really work, *Purging our conſciences from dead works, to ſerve the living God, cleanſing us from all ſin*, 1 John 1. 7. and therefore it is called the *ſprinkling of the blood of Jeſus*, 1 Pet. 1. 2. In Baptiſme, in a ſtanding Ordinance, this is held out, The party intereſſed in Covenant is dipped in, or waſhed with water, and the reaſon of it given, *Acts* 22. 16. *Ariſe, and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the Name of the Lord.* Chriſt promiſes to his Church living bread, and water *whereof whoſoever drinketh ſhall never thirſt.* He further explaines himſelf: *The bread which I will give, is my fleſh, which I will give for the life of the world*, Joh. 6. 51. *My fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed*, Joh. 6. 55. Chriſt being to dye, holds this out in outward ſignes, and with his own Comment upon them, Taking and breaking bread, he ſaith, *This is my body*; Taking the cup, he ſaith, *This is the cup in the New Teſtament in my blood ſhed for them, and for many, for the remiſſion of ſinnes.* In elements of frequent uſe, ordinary, eaſy to be compaſſed, theſe high myſteries and ſingular mercies are ſhadowed.

SECT. IV.

A further Corollary drawn from the ſame Doctrine.

The neceſſity of explanation of Sacramental ſignes.

FOurthly, Then there is a neceſſity that theſe Sacramental ſignes be opened, explained, the myſtery cleared, the thing ſignified held out, and the Analogy and proportion made known; otherwiſe the ſoul is ſtill left in the dark, and no benefit reaped, either for the help of our faith, or clearing of our underſtanding. There is no Sacrament (as *Calvin* well obſerves) without a promiſe preceding. The Sacrament is an appendant to the promiſe as a ſeal among men is to a Covenant; an earneſt to a bargain, or a ring hath been to a marriage; were there no promiſe, there were nothing in thoſe ſignes; As where there is no Covenant, there is nothing confirmed by a ſeal; where there is no bargain, nothing is ratified by earneſt given; where there is no matrimoniall conſent, the ring would be but an impoſture; the Word of promiſe gives being to the Sacrament, according to that received ſpeech, § *The Word is added to the Element, and it is made a Sacrament.* And there can be no improvement of the Sacrament, to any ſpirituall advantage, without underſtanding of the promiſe. Were the ſignes, ſuch as did proclaime their own ſignification, as a footſtep, the foot that made the impreſſion, or a ſhadow the body, then the ſignes might ſtand alone, and ſpeak their own intentions; But being creatures for civill uſes, and having onely an aptneſſe in them to hold out the thing that they ſignifie, and (as hath been ſaid) equally apt to other ſignifications, a further explanation is neceſſary. Signes among men muſt have their ſignifications known as well as ſounds in muſical, and military inſtruments; otherwiſe as none could know in the one what is piped, or harped, nor upon ſound could prepare themſelves to battell, 1 *Cor.* 14. 7, 8. ſo in the other, none can know what is ſhadowed out or reſembled. There was a cuſtome to ratifie Covenants by killing a calfe, and the Covenanters paſſage between the parts of it; as you may ſee, *Jerem.* 34. He that underſtood not the meaning of that ceremony, could know nothing of a Covenant, by that meanes between parties to be ſolemnized, none underſtand any more *then* by ſight, then many of us do now by the reading of it. A garland at the door,

§ Accedit verbum ad elementum & fit Sacramentum.

door (if cuſtome did not give us a reaſon of it) would ſpeak no more to a paſſenger without, then a flower in the window within. To ſee Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper, acted in the higheſt way of decency, and reverence, may poſſeſſe with wonder, but not at all edifie the ignorant beholder. Here as almoſt every where we have thoſe of the Church of *Rome* our adverſaries. And there hath been no ſmall conteſt, whether this word which gives being to Sacraments, be *Concionatorium*, or *Conſecratorium*, whether it be a word for *communicants inſtruction*, or the *elements conſecration*? He that pleaſes may read *Bellar. de Sacramentis in genere, lib.* 1. *Cap.* 19, 20. *Suarez de Sacramentis, diſput.* 2. *quæſt. Sexageſ. art.* 8. on the one part. *Chamier de Sacramentis in genere, Cap.* 15. *Whitaker prælect de Sacram. Cap.* 6. on the other part. All of which was occaſioned (as *Chamier* obſerves) by a ſpeech of *Calvin, lib.* 4. *Inſtitut. Cap.* 14. *Sect.* 4. who ſpeaking to that common ſaying, that a Sacrament doth conſiſt of a word, and outward ſigne, ſaith, [h] *We are to underſtand ſuch a word, that hath not power of conſecration of the element barely with a noiſe whiſpered, without ſenſe or faith, as by a magicall ſpell; But ſuch as being preached, or publiſhed, gives us to underſtand what the viſible ſign meanes. Therefore that which is done* (ſaith he) *under the Tyranny of the Pope, is not without a notable prophanation of the myſteries, for they have thought it enough for the Prieſt to mutter the forme of conſecration, while the people ſtand amazed, and without underſtanding; yea, they purpoſely provide, that no help in knowledge ſhould come to the people, pronouncing all in Latine among illiterate men; yea, afterward ſuperſtition ſo farre prevailed, that they beleeved conſecration to be done aright, when it was done with a low muttering ſound, which few could hear.* A notable character worthy of his penne, ſetting out to the life their art, to hold the world in blindneſſe. In ſtead of giving an account, what hath been on both parts handled in this Controverſy, I ſhall lay down that which I will judge to be truth in ſeverall propoſitions.

[h] Verbum enim intelligere debemus, non quod ſine ſenſu, & fide inſuſurratum, ſolo ſtrepitu velut magica incantatione conſecrandi elementi vim habeat: Sed quod prædicatum intelligere nos faciat quid viſibile ſignum ſibi velit. Quod ergo ſub Papæ Tyrannide factitatum eſt, non caruit ingenti myſteriorum profanatione. Putarunt enim ſatis eſſe ſi Sacerdos populo ſine intelligentia obſtupente, conſecrationis formulam obmurmuraret. Imo id data opera caverunt, ne quid doctrinæ inde ad plebem proveniret omnia enim Latine pronunciarunt apud homines illiteratos. Poſt ea, eouſque erupit Superſtitio, ut conſecrationem non niſi rauco murmure quod a paucis exaudiretur rite peragi crederent.

Explicatory Propoſitions.

A word of inſtitution neceſſary.

Firſt, That an inſtitution from God, and words from his mouth, that hold out ſuch an inſtitution of every Sacrament, is of abſolute neceſſity, even to the very being of a Sacrament; It were a dumbe element, and a ſuperſtitious, Ceremonious obſervation without it, if we can find no inſtitution for water-Baptiſme: our men that ſtand for a pure ſpirit-Baptiſme, will have the upper hand in that particular. But here our adverſaries and we are at an agreement.

Conſecration reſpects not the elements but participants.

Secondly, That conſecration, (if we may ſo call it) that is uſed in the publique ſolemnization of any Sacrament, is not in reſpect of the elements or outward ſignes themſelves, whoſe eſſence remaines entire and unchanged: But it is for their ſakes that uſe theſe ſignes, and unto whom in their uſe, onely they ſuffer a change from common to ſacred: And therefore being not for the elements, but for believers ſakes, a magical incantation is not of uſe, but verbal inſtruction. Therefore that of *Bellarmine* in the name of all the Catholicks (as he calls them) i *That the word which makes a Sacrament, is onely a few words preſcribed of God, to be pronounced by the Prieſt, over the matter of the Sacrament, is not to be ſuffered.* Thoſe words might as well be concealed, as thus muttered, the elements do not heare them, neither do they ſuffer any change by them: That ſpeech of *Auſtin* we willingly grant, that the *word is added to the element, and it is made a Sacrament*: But not with a Romiſh Gloſſe upon it, that by the word there ſhould be underſtood, barely the uttering, or (as they would rather have it) the muttering of a few words; But the word of inſtitution, holding forth a Divine deſignation of it to that end and uſe, which is not to be concealed from thoſe for whoſe uſe it is ordained (as though it did work by way of a ſecret change) but in the plaineſt way to be made known to them. So that thoſe bare words in Baptiſme, *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, &c.* are not that which makes it up into a Sacrament: But the command of Jeſus Chriſt, by the application of water to baptize in that Name: Neither is the uttering of thoſe words, *This is my body, This Cup in the New Teſtament is my blood*, ſufficient, but the whole ſeries of the inſtitution, in the words and actions of Chriſt Jeſus.

Nam Catholici omnes docent, verbum Sacramenti eſſe pauca quædum verba à Deo præſcripta quæ ſuper materiam à miniſtro pronuntianda ſunt.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, For an orderly adminiſtration of the Sacrament, it is of ſingular uſe, that the inſtitution be repeated, and that in Scripture-language (which *Bellarmine* confeſſes we do alwayes in Baptiſme, and many of us at leaſt out of 1 *Cor.* 11. at the Lords Supper,) and much for edification, to have them briefly explained. This addes authority, and honour to the adminiſtration, and the underſtanding of many deploredly ignorant is hereby benefited. If Parents muſt teach their children, when they ſaw the rite of the Paſſeover, a reaſon of it, *Exod.* 12. then much more ſhould Miniſters of the Goſpel teach it their people. Chriſtians ſhould act nothing in way of worſhip of God, but they ſhould ſee and know reaſon for their actings.

Repetition and explanation of the words of inſtitution ſingularly uſeful.

Fourthly, It is not eſſential to a Sacrament, that a preciſe forme of words be obſerved in the adminiſtration of it, ſo that the being of a Sacrament is loſt if a word be changed; But it is ſufficient, that the ſumme and ſubſtance of the inſtitution be held out, and repeated; and the ſigns accordingly in the adminiſtration applyed to the end for which they are ordained; to illuſtrate and ſeal the thing ſignified to thoſe that partake of it, (though a licentious freedom of variation of the words is to be avoyded, ſo the ſenſe and meaning of the inſtitution may be, if not loſt, yet at leaſt obſcured) there being no ſecret force in the ſyllables themſelves, uttered with all the conſecrating intention that the Prieſt can imagine, to create a new Sacrament.

A preciſe forme of words not eſſentiall in a Sacrament.

Bellarmine, lib. 1. *de Sacram. in genere, cap.* 21. hath a propoſition to the contrary, [k] *Not onely the things themſelves,* (ſaith he) *in the Sacraments under the New Covenant,* (of which he ſaith, there is little difference between them and us) *but the words are ſo determinate, that they may not any thing be changed*; yet when he hath done, he is put to it, to limit his own propoſition, and ſhewes there may be a variation ſix wayes; in ſome of which the eſſence of a Sacrament is loſt, the ſubſtantiall forme being taken away; in others the accidental forme onely, ſo that the eſſence continnes notwithſtanding ſuch variation; ſo that he doth not onely approve of the determination of Pope *Zachary*, who in an Epiſtle to *Bonifacius* reſolves, that when ſome out of ignorance of the Latine tongue did baptize *in nomine Patria, filia, & ſperitua ſancta*, that the ſubſtantial forme was not altered; But alſo acknowledges that the Baptiſme of the Greeks was valid, and the ſubſtance not changed when they baptized

[k] Non ſolum res, ſed etiam verba in Sacramentis novæ legis à Deo determinata ſunt, ut non liceat quicquam immutare.

tized in this way, *Let the ſervant of Chriſt be baptized in the Name, &c.* yet allowing of it, onely upon that account, becauſe the Church of *Rome* did tolerate it; ſo that their toleration, or prohibition can give, or take away the very ſubſtantial forme of Sacraments: the eſſence of them is at their courteſie. The truth of this propoſition is clear. 1. No preſcribed forme of words is laid down in the Old Teſtament, as is confeſt; and therefore *Bellarmine* puts it into his propoſition, That in the Sacraments of the New Law, the words are ſo determinate, that nothing is to be changed: And that the Apoſtles did uſe any ſuch preſcript forme in ſo preciſe a way, cannot be proved; yea, the contrary is more then probable, conſidering the multitudes in ſo ſhort a ſpace baptized, *Act.2. Act.8. Peter* exhorts his converts, to be *baptized in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*, Act.2.38. And thoſe mentioned, *Act.19.5.* were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus. And *Bonaventure* (as he is quoted by *Whitaker*) ſayes that *the Apoſtles baptized in the name of Chriſt.* And *Scotus* (as the ſame Author affirms) ſayes, that *if any ſhould baptize in that manner, he durſt not ſay it were no Baptiſme*, and this with good reaſon; ſeeing Baptiſme in the Name of Chriſt, virtually comprizes the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt, His work being to reconcile man unto God, eſſentially, and not perſonally conſidered. 2. Either the very ſyllables themſelves, in which the inſtitution is ſet down, is the forme, and contains the eſſence of Baptiſme, or elſe the ſenſe and meaning: But it is not the very words and ſyllables themſelves. This is clear in reaſon, and confeſt by the adverſary. Firſt, it is clear in reaſon, then the ſame words and ſyllables muſt be uſed in which they were pronounced, when they were firſt inſtituted; That was the *Syriack* Tongue, (as is believed) being the language in *Judea* at that time, or at leaſt the *Greek*, in which Tongue the words of the inſtitution were committed to writing. But the forme of the Sacraments is never tyed to thoſe Tongues, to neither of them. Papiſts officiate in Latine, Orthodox Churches in their own language, in which the ſame thing in other ſyllables is held forth. This is confeſt by the adverſary. *Bellarmine* approves (as we have heard) the ratification of that Baptiſme, where ſcarce ever a word was aright uttered, and that upon this account, that it might be eaſily underſtood what he would have ſaid, as well by the act of baptizing as by the word, *In nomine,*

Arguments evincing the truth of the propoſition.

In the name, for that was aright pronounced. It is not then the words, but that which ought to be intended in the words that holds forth the inſtitution, which may be further from the *Jeſuite* cleared, in that he confeſſes, Scripture to be too ſhort, to hold out the forme of Baptiſme-inſtitution, which [1] can be gathered from no place, he ſaith, but that of *Matth.* 28. 19. *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt.* But there it is not ſaid, I baptize, (as he obſerves) nor doth Chriſt command to ſay, in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and holy Ghoſt; but to baptize in the Name of the Father, &c. If it be done in that Name by that authority, it were (ſaith he) ſufficient, had we not tradition to the contrary, *De Sacramentis in Genere, cap.* 19. All which makes it appear, that an inſtitution is neceſſary, and not a certain number of words of abſolute neceſſity.

[1] Nos reſpondemus, illud (hoc facite) referre ad totam actionem Chriſti, ita ut comprehendat etiam verba. Id quod (ut omittam nunc alia argumenta) diſcimus ex traditione, & uſu Catholicæ Eccleſiæ quæ traditio ſi non recipiatur in dubium revocabitur etiam forma baptiſmi, nam unde, quæſo, colligitur, dum aqua aſpergitur, dicenda eſſe illa verba: Baptizo te in nomine Patris & filii & Spiritus ſancti? Certe non aliunde quam ex illis verbis Matth. ult. Docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris & Filii & Spiritus ſancti. At ex hoc loco id non poteſt certe colligi niſi recipiatur Eccleſiæ traditio. Non enim Dominus ait, dicite Baptizo te in nomine Patris, &c. Satis igitur erit ſi aſpergentes aquam dicanus, in nomine Patris, & Filii, &c.

A Sermon formally ſo called is not eſſential to a Sacrament.

Fifthly, A Sermon formally ſo called, to be preacht at the ſame time, as the Sacrament is adminiſtred, is no way of the eſſence of Sacraments. This *Chamier* worthily rejects, as a calumny put upon proteſtant Writers: No proteſtant Writer ever did affirm it: *Bellarmine* would fain faſten it upon *Calvin*, and *Beza*, but confeſſes that *Calvin* ſpeaks doubtfully in it; And ſometimes ſeemes to ſpeak of a Sermon, as diſtinct from the Sacrament. They that hold this opinion, muſt not onely conclude it to be the greateſt of prophanations to adminiſter the elements when no Sermon is preached; But whenſoever they adminiſter any Sacrament, their Sermon muſt ever be of that ſubject; for to make a Sermon eſſential to Sacraments, which treats nothing about Sacraments, is to make the body of a bird eſſential to a beaſt. That which we ſay, is, that every word in the inſtitutions of Sacraments is for inſtruction of communicants, and without ſuch inſtruction, they can make no actuall improvement of them to any ſpiritual benefit, either of juſtification, or ſanctification; which yet is not of abſolute neceſſity to

be

be preſt, as oft as ever the Sacrament is taken; And words about the Sacrament teaching, and conſecrating are not (as they make them) of an oppoſite kind. All words tending to conſecration as [*I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, &c. This is my body, This Cup, &c.*] are words as well to inſtruct, as to conſecrate; are *Concionatoria* as well, as *Conſecratoria*: ſo that all words of conſecration are words for inſtruction (though all for inſtruction are not for conſecration) as might many wayes be evidenced. 1. They are ſignificant words, to be uttered by the voyce of a publick teacher. 2. They are Scripture words, and whatſoever is there writen, is for our learning, *Rom.*15.4. why is it wrote if not for reading? Why do we read if not for learning? 3. The Apoſtles to whom Chriſt gave charge concerning the Sacrament, were to underſtand themſelves what they did, and to inſtruct thoſe to whom they did commend it likewiſe. But they had no other way to know the Sacraments, either of Baptiſme, or the Lords Supper, but from the words of inſtitution, which they call by the name of conſecration. 4. The Apoſtle going about to reforme the abuſes about the Lords Supper, and to teach the *Corinthians* a right way of celebration, repeates the whole inſtitution, and layes down exactly that which they ſay is of the eſſence of conſecration, and that to inſtruct, & not to conſecrate. The words of conſecration are his words of inſtruction. 5. To this we may add that of *Auſtin*, not barely his Authority, but the ſtrength of his reaſon, *Tract.*80.*in Jo.* Commenting upon his own words, *The word is added to the element, and it is made a Sacrament.* [m] *Whence is there that power* (ſaith he) *that water ſhould touch the body, and the heart ſhould be made clean, but the word working it, not upon that account becauſe it is ſpoken, but becauſe it is believed? For in the word it ſelf the ſound that paſſes is one thing, and the efficacy that remaines is another; and this (ſaith he) is the word that is Preached.* There is none can deny, but that the words of the Sacrament are to be believed, and in caſe they are to be believed, they are to be preached and heard, for who can believe on him of whom they have not heard, and how can they heare without a Teacher? *Rom.*10.15. This place of *Auſtin*, [n] *Bellarmine* ſaith, *hath troubled many*, and *Whitaker* ſaith, they have as much troubled him

[m] Unde iſta tanta virtus aquæ, ut corpus tangat & cor abluat, niſi faciente verbo? non quia dicitur ſed quia creditur. Nam & in ipſo verbo, aliud eſt ſonus tranſiens, aliud virtus manens. Hoc eſt verbum fidei quod prædicumus ait Apoſtolus.

[n] Locus hic mire torquere ſolet non nullos.

him as any other. He rejects *Calvins* Interpretation of it, and then rejects ſeveral Interpretations of his own party, and at laſt produces his own, which *Whitaker* ſayes, is wholly borrowed out of *Allen*, o that *Auſtin ſometimes ſpeaks of the Sacramental word, and ſometimes of the Word as Preacht*, which two with him are altogether different; and yet *Auſtin* muſt by all means be acquit from Equivocation; we willingly yeeld that he doth not equivocate, and therefore the Sacramental word is a branch of that word that is Preached. He that pleaſes may read *Suarez* and *Bellarmines* arguments anſwered by *Chamier*, *lib.* 1. *de Sacra. in genere*, *cap.* 17, 18.

o Dico igitur, Auguſtinum hoc loco, non ſemper loqui de eodem verbo, ſed nunc de Sacramentali, nunc de concionali.

CHAP. VI. SECT. I.

God is the Author of all Sacraments, and Sacramental rites.

THeſe Sacramental ſignes have God for their Author, as it followes in the definition, and is implyed (as we have heard) in the text of the Apoſtle, *Abraham* receiving it, God appointed it, *Gen.* 17. 10. So that the Obſervation is,

God is the Author of all Sacraments, and Sacramentall rites.

This is clear of it ſelf, and hath ſcarce any adverſary. Look through all Sacraments, whether ordinary, or extraordinary, whether taken in the largeſt ſignification for holy ſignes, or in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, as here defined; we ſhall ſtill find that they were by Divine appointment; The *Cloud*, the *Paſſage through the Red-Sea*, Exod. 13. *Manna*, Exod. 16. The *Rock*, Exod. 17. The *Rainbowe*, Geneſ. 9. *Gideons fleece*, Jndg. 6. The *ſhadow* on *Ahaz his dyal*, Iſa. 38. *Circumciſion*, Gen. 17. The *Paſſeover*, Exod. 12. Levit. 12. *Baptiſme*, Matth. 28. The *Lords Supper*, Matth. 26. 1 Cor. 11. All of them are of Divine inſtitution; And though Poꝑiſh Writers are much put to it, to find any Divine inſtitution for ſome of their Sacraments, (as may God willing be ſhewen) yet with a joynt conſent they acknowledge this that we ſay, and give their reaſons of it. *Thomas Aquinas* puts the queſtion, *part.*

3.

3. *quæst.* 64. *art.* 2. *Whether Sacraments be alone of Divine institution?* and determines it in the affirmative. *Bellarmine* spends the whole 23. *Cap.* of his first book, *de Sacra. in genere*, to assert, *that onely Christ is the author of the Sacraments.* And *Suarez*, *Quæst.* 64. *disput.* 12. *Sect.* 1. laies down this conclusion, [a] *that the Lord Christ immediately, and by himself, did institute all the Sacraments of the New Covenant*; And addes a second conclusion, *that all the Sacraments of the old Law were immediately instituted of God himself*; either of them both quote *Canon.* 1. *sess.* 7. of the Councel of Trent, that thus determines, [b] *If any shall say that the Sacraments of the New Covenant, were not instituted by Christ, let him be accursed*; which *Canon* they both understand to thunder out an *anathema* against Protestants; seeing we hold that their *extreme unction*, and *confirmation* were never instituted of Christ, (to which they may adde *matrimony*; for though the God of nature did ordain it, yet not Christ the Mediatour of the Covenant) which they affirme to be Sacraments, and I think they did not mistake the meaning of the *Councell*, seeing the *Canon* laies a curse, not onely on those that shall deny that Christ was the author of all the Sacraments, but also on those that shall say there were more or lesse then seven, reckoning up their seven in order. But we may retort this curse upon them, as well as they fling it at us, seeing they deny the Baptisme of *John* to be of Divine institution, and make it meerly humane, as *Bellar. lib.* 1. *de Baptis. Cap.* 20. which yet we know to be a Sacrament, and able sufficiently to cleare it, that God himself, and not *John* was the Author of it; Let *John* himself speak whether he went on his owne head, on this work; *He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the holy Ghost*, Joh. 1. 33. The people of the Jewes certainly had another opinion of his Baptisme, as appears by their reasoning, when Christ demanded, *The Baptisme of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? and they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say from heaven, he will say unto us, Why did ye not then beleeve him? But if we shall say of men, we fear the people; for all hold John as a Prophet*, Matth. 21. 25. 26. When the opinion among the people

[a] Christus Dominus immediate ac per se instituit omnia Sacramenta novæ legis. Dico secundo, Sacramenta veteris legis omnia fuere ab ipso Deo immediate instituta.

[b] Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, Anathema sit.

Baptismus Johannis ab ipso Johanne institutus erat.

Baptisme of John of Divine institution.

ple was so generall, that the Chief Priests and Elders were afraid to oppose it, had it been an errour doubtlesse Christ would not in that way have nourished them in it; And to say with *Bellarmine* that [d] *God did command him to baptize, but the particular rite was left unto John himself*, is nothing. When Christ demanded of the Baptisme of John, whether it were from heaven, or of men? the Priests and Elders to whom he spake, understood the whole work, and to conceit that the work was commanded, and the way of doing concealed, is an ungrounded fancy. All that are confest to be Sacraments, are (we see) yeelded to be of Divine institution, which is further plain in reason.

[d] Deus solum in genere inspiravit, & inspiratione, illa mandavit ut baptizaret: sed ritum in particulari quo baptizandum esset, ipse Johannes instituit, non a Deo præscriptum accepit.

First, Sacraments are parts of worship, a piece of the homage that is due from man to God; And it is God, and not man that is to prescribe in his own worship; here God hath declared himself to be jealous, *Exod.* 20. 5. that not any thing of the invention of man come within that worship that is Divine. And if *Nadab* and *Abihu* fell for adulterating the worship of God, bringing in strange fire, when fire from heaven was provided to their hands; How shall they stand that coin a worship it self, as do our adversaries, or put a new stamp upon it, when it is set up of God, which is their way likewise? Marriage which is an Ordinance without the Church, they make a Sacrament in the Church; Of duties they make ordination, and repentance Sacraments; and in case Pharisees made the Commandements of God void by their tradition, when they imposed a necessity of washing of hands before meat, when yet they did not raise it to the honour of a Sacrament; How much more had *John* offended, if out of his own fancy he had set up such an Ordinance as Baptisme? *David* hath been charged that he appointed singers, and other officers in the house of God, without any command or direction from heaven; but the contrary to this appeares, 2 *Chron.* 29. 25. where in the life of *Hezekiah* it is said, *He set the Levites in the house of the Lord, with Cymbals, with Psalteries, and with harpes, according to the commandement of David, and of Gad the Kings Seer, and Nathan the Prophet; for so was the Commandement of the Lord by his Prophets.*

Secondly, Sacraments are notes of distinction between the people of God and others that beare not that relation to him, as we have heard Circumcision and uncircumcision divided the world. The Circumcised were a people of God, when all others were

children of a ſtrange god, ſo we may ſay of all Sacraments; And as men of place alone have power to give liveries to their own ſervants, to diſtinguiſh them from thoſe that have their dependance on others, ſo God hath alone power to give differencing Cognizances to his ſervants likewiſe.

Thirdly, God onely can give ſtrength and efficacy to the Sacraments; what that is reſts to be enquired, and is not a little controverted; but whatſoever it is, that it is wholly of God was never doubted; and he onely that can give efficacy to them, is to ordaine them. This is *Thomas Aquinas* his reaſon in the place mentioned.

Fourthly, Sacraments are teaching ſignes, viſible words, whereby man is inſtructed in Divine myſteries; but God alone is the author of the Word; *It is given by inſpiration of God*, 2 Timothy 3. 15. God alone therefore is the author of Sacraments.

Fifthly, Sacraments are ſeales put to promiſe, annext for confirmation of Covenants, as ſhall be further ſhewen. But he onely that makes the promiſe and appoints the Covenant, can give the ſeal. The Schoolman then quoted by *Bullinger, de Sacr. Decad. 5. Ser. 6.* hath well minded the Church, that ſhe is no Lady over the Sacraments, but barely a ſervant, and can no more appoint a Sacrament, then abrogate a Divine Commandement. And *Bellarmine* puts this for the firſt reaſon, that Miniſters are Stewards of the Myſteries of God; therefore they are not to inſtitute them, but being inſtituted of God, are onely to adminiſter them.

This holds true not onely of Sacraments in their eſſence, that none may adde any to the number of thoſe that God hath inſtituted; But of all that is of the integrality of Sacraments likewiſe there is not the leaſt Sacramental rite, that is to be of humane, but all of Divine inſtitution. There is the ſame reaſon of the whole, and of every part. He that may not appoint a Sacrament, may appoint no piece of a Sacrament. A worſhip made up of Divine and humane Commandements, ſtands in the Church like *Nebuchadnezzars* image, the *head of Gold*, but the *feet of earth*. The Poets device of a mans neck joyned to a horſes head is not ſo great a ſolœciſme. *Thomas Aquinas* ſaw that this might be objected againſt much in the Sacraments in the Church of *Rome*, and therefore when he had put the queſtion, Whether Sacraments have their inſtitution from God? in the firſt place objecteth,

[c] *that there are ſome things done in the Church of which there is no mention in Scripture, as Chriſme wherewith men are confirmed, and oyl wherewith Prieſts are ordained, and much elſe, as well words as actions* (ſaith he) *which we uſe in Sacraments*; and anſweres, *that thoſe things which are done in Sacraments inſtituted by man are not of the neceſſity of the Sacrament, but are uſed for ſolemnity, and to beget devotion, and reverence in thoſe that receive them. But thoſe things that are of neceſſity to Sacraments, are inſtituted of Chriſt, who is God-man.* But how the Angelicall Doctor can be reconciled to himſelf, I cannot ſee; when, *part.* 3. *quæſt.* 72. *art.* 2. he concludes, that Chriſme (which with him is oyl mixt with Balſome,) is the matter of this Sacrament; as alſo *Bellarmine de Sacramento* Confirmationis, *Cap.* 8. *prop.* 1. which he ſaies is certain among Catholiques from the *Councell of Florence*, and *the Councell of Trent*. and gallantly proves it out of 2 *Cor.* 1. 21. *Now he which ſtabliſheth us with you in Chriſt, and hath anointed us, is God*; And certainly the matter of a Sacrament is of neceſſity to a Sacrament. And ſecondly, what devotion or reverence the things that are inſtituted of man can beget in the Sacrament appointed of God, can hardly be ſhewen. It is as an addition of Tinne, to ſilver in our common coine; As *Ahaz* his Altar fetcht from *Damaſcus* to the worſhip at *Hieruſalem*. It is true that a reverend way of ſolemnizing theſe Ordinances in order, and decency, keeps up their honour, and addes to their honour comparative, to that whith from ſome hands they had, and much is variable about them in thoſe things that are meer matter of order, in which Scripture gives no precept; But no device of man addes any thing to the honour of an inſtitution of heaven; God writes no imperfect work to leave it to man to adde his ſupplement.

[e] Ea quæ ſunt divinitus inſtituta, t aduntur nobis in ſacra Scriptura, ſed quædam aguntur in Sacramentis, de quibus nulla ſit mentio in ſacra Scriptura, puta de Chriſmate, quo homines confirmantur, & oleo quo Sacerdotes inunguntur, & de multis aliis tam verbis quam factis quibus utimur in Sacramentis, Illa quæ aguntur in Sacramentis, per homines inſtituta, non ſunt de neceſſitate Sacramenti, ſed ad quandam ſolennitatem, quæ adhibetur Sacramentis, ad excitandam devotionem & reverentiam in his qui Sacramenta ſuſcipiunt. Ea vero quæ ſunt de neceſſitate Sacramenti, ab ipſo Chriſto inſtituta ſunt, qui eſt Deus & homo.

SECT. II.

Corallaries from the former Doctrine.

Sacraments must have the honour of divine Ordinances.

THen let them have that esteem that is due to the Ordinances, and institutions of heaven; Let not our thoughts be below God, when our eyes are fixt on them, or our hearts employed about them. If we look at the terrene part of these institutions, our thoughts may then fall flat, and their esteem very low; many a creature of God will stand in competition with them: Themselves being of earth must needs fix our thoughts to earth, and so there will be no more then bare formality in the work, perhaps a confused conceit of some holy thing which is little understood, begetting a superstitious blind devotion: But when we consider from whose hand they are, and the end for which they serve, as seales appointed of God, to ratifie to our souls his gift of Christ, pardon of sin by him, and consequently glory with him; these despised Ordinances will be in more honour. We look upon Parchment, Inke, Wax, in the shops where they are put to sale, as common Commodities: thousand of shops have more high-prized wares; How low do men look on them comparative to those things of which the Exchange glories: But he that hath one skin of this Parchment, made up into a pattent, or deed with the Broad-seal to it; confirming a grant of some large revenue, eyes it in another manner, and prizes it above thousands of all that we have spoken of, as not with him to be named that day. We may look upon water as an element, as mean as it is common, as low in our esteem, as it is in price; and upon bread and wine as somewhat more noble: But a slender pittance of either, is with us of slender value. But when they serve for a seal of all that the Gospel tenders, and are made up into a seal of the Gospel grant, it should be, and to a spiritual eye is, of more high, and honourable regard. If this were duly considered, Sacraments would be had in more honour with us.

The contempt, or neglect of Baptisme censured.

First, The Sacrament of Baptisme, that door of entrance into the Church of Christ, our matriculation into the society of Saints; when other Ordinances are over in the Congregation, and

and that entered upon, we ſee the way of a great party immediately to poſt out: The Apoſtles thought it too low a buſineſs for the Lord Chriſt to have to deal with infants that had not legs to carry them, but muſt be brought in the armes of others; and therefore rebuked thoſe that brought them. Theſe think it below them, to waite upon a buſineſs where ſuch onely are concerned: Infant Ordinances are below their attendance. Theſe are of two ſorts. 1. Thoſe who out of judgement leave, and are ſo principled, that they think they muſt leave, and declare their diſſent from that practice. 2. Thoſe that out of neglect leave: They judge that infants of right ought to be baptized: It is the Miniſters duty to do it, and Parents and near friends and neighbours are to ſee it done, but it might be done in a corner, with more or fewer, it doth not matter: when they are gone, it will be baptized, and what is it to them to waite on the Baptiſme of it? The firſt of theſe that in departing, act out of principles that they have laid, (and therefore in caſe they were better principled, there is hope that they might act better) are of two ſorts. 1. Thoſe that proteſt againſt all title of infants to this Ordinance; and therefore upon that account refuſe to honour it with their preſence: And their very departure from it ſpeakes this language, *Here is one that is to be dedicated to God in an Ordinance that is of God,* (For I ſpeak not of thoſe that go above water-Baptiſme, they hardly come into us, and therefore do not on this account leave) *but one that God will not own, being within no Covenant of his, and therefore no member of that ſociety that appertaines to him, to whom we ſay,* in caſe God will not, who then muſt receive him: If he be no member of this ſociety, nor in capacity of it, then he is alſo in an uncapacity to be ſaved? *Act.* 2.47. But they will not ſo determine, they ſay; but leave him to his own Maſter; But denying him a Covenant intereſt, and all title to Church-fellowſhip, they deny that Chriſt is his Maſter, (though that expreſly affirme it, *Levit.* 25 42. yet they peremptorily deny it) and ſo thruſt him from all intereſt in his redemption. Papiſts were the firſt in this cruel infant-damning principle, That they are out of Covenant with God; Anabaptiſts taking it from them, fight for it with their weapons. May we not think that Papiſts laugh in their ſleeves, to ſee theſe men of new light, diſpute for them, reforme for them, ſeparate with them? And do they not very well know, that if by theſe mens

help, they can bring into the Proteſtant Church their premiſes, we ſhall never be able to avoid their concluſions. Others are not ſo rigid againſt all infants, but appear more tender to ſome; Infants of believers they judge to have their intereſt; when parents make good their part in the Covenant, and are ſteady in it, then they judge the children to be in Covenant; and this their charity (as well as it can) muſt determine. Theſe might do well, 1. To examine thoſe texts that themſelves produce for the intereſt of ſuch infants, of whoſe Parents their charity thus hopefully determines, and ſee whether thoſe texts will not carry it for all the infants of profeſſing Parents. I am ſure I know none but carry it as clear for all, as they do for any. 2. Let them conſider, whether children of God are not to be baptized? Theſe infants of whoſe Parents they have ſaddeſt thoughts, are children of God, *Ezek.*16.21. Whether ſervants of God ought not to be baptized? Theſe children of ſuch Parents are ſervants of God. *Levit.* 25. 42. Whether Saints are not to be baptized? Such children are Saints, where one Parent is removed from an infidel, 1 *Cor.*7.14.

But the greateſt part leave us not out of error, but neglect; not as being miſled in judgement, but prophane: Let theſe ſeriouſly take to heart theſe Queries. 1. Why did you joyn in any Ordinance in publick, as that of praying, hearing, ſinging? was it not upon that account, as of God, by his appointment? Why then are thoſe attended, and this (which you allow alſo to be of God) neglected? 2. Is this the cloſing duty, doth not a bleſſing follow upon this Ordinance? quitting this you quit both; you will joyn with others in the duty: but you will give them leave to be alone in receiving a bleſſing upon it. 3. Is not he, ſhe, or they, that now are to be received a fellow-member, or members? muſt not thou, and they, make up one body? are not they a part of Chriſt myſtical, as thou? It is but a little honour that thou giveſt them, when thou haſt not patience to abide a few minutes, to be a witneſs of their happy initiation. 4. Doth not their caſe, upon this account call for thy prayers? the Churches prayers? It would ſcarce pleaſe that thy own child ſhould be offered to God in this Ordinance, without a word of prayer to God. They that conſider the great buſineſs that lyes upon the hands of a Chriſtian, that high engagement to which this Ordinance tyes, the manifold temptations

that

that accompany a Christian course cannot but confess, that their case calls for all mens prayers. 5. Note the scandal, and offence that thou givest; the censure that thou leavest behind thee upon others that joyn in the duty; and on the other hand, the censure that thou beares from them, in thus forsaking of them; either Minister, and people do manifest their trifling folly, and so a taking of Gods Name in vain in the open Congregation on the Lords day in his presence, to wait upon such an Ordinance that is unworthy of the honour of thy presence; or else thou manifestest much sinful neglect in thy refusal, or with drawing of thy self. Thou canst not but think their continuance is vain, or else must conclude thy own departure to be wicked. 6. Is there nothing of edification in this Ordinance? no Word to be heard, by which thou maiest profit? dost not thou here see Gods engagement to thy soul, and thy souls engagement unto God? Doth Baptisme save, as the Arke of *Noah*, and is there nothing in it, whereby thou maiest be benefited?

But here is objected, weakness of body, or haste of business, that lyes upon them in that they can bear no longer.

Answer, 1. How is it, that these reasons do not send thee away from other Ordinances, as well as barely from this? that thy weakness can bear, and thy business stay just to this time, that thy patience is bespoke for this work: when the Minister intreats to stay this Sacrament, a man might think mens ears mistook, and they thought he said, Turn your backs, clap to your pew-doores, tumble down the stayrs, haste, be gone, give your *Amen* to no more prayers, stay for no blessing; If these were the words, many could make no more haste to be gone, then they do on request to stay. 2. Let that text be well weighed, *Ezek.* 46.9,10. where order is given, both for the comming in, and going out of the publick assembly. The Prince may ordinarily speak of as much business-intanglements to hinder as any other, by reason of the burden of his heavy employments, and yet he is to go in with the first, and stay in with the last; and his example is prest, that it may be a precedent to others. Some are slow to come in, and as hasty to be gone; come as a Bear to the stake, and fly away as an Ape from a whip. They are for Ordinances, and from Ordinances, as a truantly boy is for school, and from school. These have none of *Jacobs* thoughts, *Surely God is in this place*, Gen. 28.16. or that they have to deal with God

God in all the Ordinances of the day, otherwiſe they would riſe up early (as *Job* to his ſacrifices) to partake of them, and would not make any ſuch forward haſte to be quit of them.

An improvement is to be made of Baptiſme.

And this reſpect, that it hath God for the Author, ſhould move us not barely to vouchſafe our preſence in the occaſional adminiſtration, which may be done gazingly, careleſſely, ſleepily; But we ſhould make uſe of our own Baptiſme; being inſtituted of God as a ſtanding Ordinance of his Church; we ſhould have other thoughts, then that as ſoon as it is paſt in the act, it is over in the uſe: we ſhould eye it all our dayes as our inlet into the ſociety of Saints, which is a greater honour then a Kings Coronation, and as a high engagement unto duty: to faith in the blood of Chriſt, to a death to ſin, and a reſurrection to righteouſneſs by power of the Spirit of Chriſt. Though it be low in the Ceremony, it is high in the obligation, tying us faſt to him whoſe name we bear by vertue of our baptiſme, our whole buſineſs ſhould be, that our conſcience may anſwer this obligation; as a ſeal put to the promiſe for pardon of our ſin, and ſalvation. If Baptiſme ſaves by the reſurrection of Chriſt (as the Apoſtle tells us, 1 *Pet.* 3.21.) there ſhould be other improvement of it; were it aright conſidered, and duly improved, it would neither ſuffer ſin nor doubtings, it would not ſuffer any way of ſin, nor any prevalency of doubtings concerning our ſpiritual ſtate and condition.

Parents ſhould look above civil decency and complement.

It ſhould quicken Parents to think of more then bare Ceremony, civil decency, and complement in the work: which is almoſt the whole of all that is regarded: If friends in due order be invited, and in a way ſuitable to their place entertained, that is the great care; any bleſſing on the Ordinance is but little mattered. When they give a child in marriage, they do not neglect a wedding-feaſt, and ſuch civil appurtenances that uſually attend: but their great care, is about aſſurance for their livelihood: on this account counſel is retained, friends conſulted: But this being as the day of their eſpouſal for viſible communion with Jeſus Chriſt, little thought is taken of the weight of that work, few prayers ſent up, or ſought for that purpoſe; did they think they were dedicated to God, they would be at care, and would not grudge pains to ſeek a bleſſing from God.

For the Lords Supper, that ſeemes often to have a little honour,

nour, when that of Baptiſme hath none at all, being adminiſtred in times of mens growth, when the other was over in mens infancy, carrying terrour in the face of it by reaſon of thoſe explicite words of the Apoſtle upon the *Corinthians* prophanation of it: *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and eateth and drinketh his own judgement.* The examination called for upon addreſſe unto it, and thoſe liſts of judgements that are upon record upon the prophanation of it, *many weak, and many ſick, and many ſleeping:* And perhaps ſome reliques of ſuperſtition not yet wholly outed, ſince that time that a corporal preſence was believed, and the bread worſhipped: As is ſaid of ſome, that they receive ſo devoutly, as though God were in the bread; and they live as though there were no God in heaven. But if the Author and nature of this Sacrament were aright weighed, another reverence, a reverence beſeeming the glory of it, would be given it, which is not my buſineſs now to proſecute, being to ſpeak here of the general nature onely of Sacraments. Men would then be content, that the whole of the Adminiſtration ſhould be carried on ſo as becomes the honour of the Ordinance, and would make it their buſineſs to promote a way that a due preparation might be made in fitting the communicants, and taking cognizance of them that come, that they may be able to diſcerne the Lords body, and ſo honour, and not prophane it. They would then take care to avoid unworthineſſe, leſt the Author of this Feaſt ſhould detect them, as the Maſter of the Feaſt did detect the man that came without his wedding-garment; we ſhould ſee more reverence in the duty, more careful conſciencious waiting upon the duty.

CHAP. VII. SECT. I.

The adæquate ſubject of Sacraments.

THe next thing here to be conſidered in this definition of a Sacrament laid down by the Apoſtle, is the ſubject of it, grounded upon the perſon that here received this ſign of Circumciſion and conſidered, as accepting of the Covenant of God,

as we have heard: He entered the Covenant in his own name, and in the name of all them that were confederates with him: And he received Circumciſion the ſign of it: and they in their time reſpectively were alſo circumciſed: and from hence theſe Conclusions may be drawn.

1. *The Covenant-people of God, are the adæquate ſubject of the Sacraments; They, and they onely, have their right and intereſt in them.*

2. *Sacraments are not arbitrary, but neceſſary; they are not only priviledges, but duties: The Covenant-people of God may, and they muſt receive them.*

3. *Their efficacy depends upon their uſe; They are no Sacraments to thoſe that do not partake of them.* Of theſe in their order.

The Covenant people of God are the adæquate ſubject of Sacraments.

Firſt, *The Covenant-people of God, are the adæquate ſubject of the Sacraments; They, and they only, have their right and intereſt in them.* There can be no truth more clear then this, in caſe we look into the Scriptures, and for full proofe of it, I ſhall lay down theſe Poſitions.

Propoſitions evincing the truth of the Point.

Firſt, *It is upon the account of the Covenant, that any among the ſons of men are of the people of God; that they have any relation to him in order and tendency to their everlaſting welfare.* Where the Covenant is not, all relation-intereſt in God is wanting; *theſe are without God*, Epheſ.2.12. Deut.29.10,11,12,13. *Ye ſtand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your Captains of your tribes, your Elders, and your Officers, with all the men of* Iſrael; *your little ones, your wives, and the ſtranger that is in thy Campe, from the hewer of wood, unto the drawer of thy water: that thou ſhouldeſt enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his Oath which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day; that he may ſtabliſh thee to day for a people to himſelf, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath ſaid unto thee, and as he hath ſworn unto thy Fathers, to Abraham, to Iſaac, and to Jacob.* They that were no people, by Covenant are made a people, as he that was no ſervant, by Covenant is made a ſervant; and ſhe that was no wife, made a wife: Theſe are *nigh*, when others are *afar off*, *Epheſ.*2.17. Hereupon the *Jewes* to whom the Covenants pertained, *Rom.*9.4. have this glory, *Pſal.*148.14. *A people neare unto the Lord.* A wife is called by the name of her husband, *Eſay* 4.1. And the whole of the family, by the name of the Maſter

ſter of the family, ſo all of the people of God in Covenant, are called by the Name of God. He owns them as his, *Epheſ.*3. 15. God mentions it as a motive taking with him, to hear prayers, 2 *Chron.*7. 14. *If my people that are called by my Name, do humble themſelves and pray, I will hear*: And the people of God urge it, as a motive to prevail that they may be heard, *Jer.*14.8, 9. *O the hope of Iſrael, the Saviour thereof in time of trouble, why ſhouldeſt thou be as a ſtranger in the land, and as a wayfaring man that turneth aſide to tarry for a night? why ſhouldeſt thou be as a man aſtonied, as a mighty man that cannot ſave? yet thou, O Lord, art in the midſt of us, we are called by thy Name, leave us not*, Eſay 64.18,19. *Our adverſaries have troden down thy ſanctuary: we are thine: thou bareſt not rule over them, they were never called by thy Name*; upon termes of Covenant onely they are the Lords

Secondly, *It is upon the ſame account that they have any intereſt in the Sacraments, which are the badges and markes of a people of God in profeſſion.* When the Covenant was entred with *Abraham*, and his ſeed, *Gen.* 17. Circumciſion was forthwith inſtituted; Theſe therefore were called *the Circumciſion*, & all others the *Uncircumciſion*, Epheſ.2.11. The title Jew did denote the people of God, *Thou art called a* Jew, (ſaith the Apoſtle) *and reſteſt in the law and makeſt thy boaſt of God*, Rom.2.17. and Jew and Circumciſion are the ſame, *Rom.* 2. 25, 26, 27. *Rom.* 3. 1. And hereupon, as *Abraham* entring Covenant was circumciſed, and his ſeed: ſo proſelytes joyning to them and their ſeed, were circumciſed. And the ſelf ſame that had their title to Circumciſion, had their intereſt in the Paſſeover, and onely theſe, as to males, *Exod.*12. 43,44,45. *This is the ordinance of the Paſſeover, there ſhall no ſtranger eat thereof: But every mans ſervant that is bought for money, when thou haſt circumciſed him, then ſhall he eate thereof*; *A Forrener and an hired ſervant ſhall not eat thereof. Rivet* on the words concludes *the* [a] *ſtranger to be every one that was not borne among the people of God, nor taken in into them*, Exod. 12. 48, 49. *And when a ſtranger ſhall ſojourne with thee, and will keep the Paſſeover to the Lord, let all his males be circumciſed, and then let him come near, and he ſhall be as one born in the land; for no uncircumciſed perſon ſhall eate thereof. One law ſhall be to him that is home-born, and unto the ſtranger that ſojourneth among you*; whence we ſee that as the Covenant did entitle to Circumciſion, which is called the Cove-

Ergo Ben necar eſt homo alterius populi qui neque in populo Dei natus eſt neque aſcitus.

nant, *Gen.* 17. 10. *Acts* 7. 8. ſo Circumciſion did entitle to the Paſſeover. Hereupon there were ordinances enacted in *Iſrael*, for obſervation of it through *Iſrael*; as, *Levit.* 23. *Numb.* 28. may be ſeen. After a long time of intermiſſion of it, we ſee a proclamation by *Hezekiah* throughout all *Iſrael*, to invite to it not onely thoſe of his own ſubjects, but all the reſt of the revolted tribes, 2 *Chron.* 30. 5. The invitation reached to all in Covenant, and onely to thoſe in Covenant, cleerly ſhewing that all Covenanters, and Covenant ers alone, are inrighted in the priviledge of Sacraments. In New Teſtament times, it is as cleer, diſcipling and baptizing go together in Chriſts commiſſion: *Diſciple Nations, and baptize them*, Matth. 28. 19. as it did before the enlargement of that commiſſion, *Joh.* 4. 1. *When the Lord knew that the Phariſees had heard that Jeſus made, and baptized more diſciples then John.* Being made diſciples, we ſee they were baptized. And a diſciple of Chriſt, converted to the faith, and in profeſſion a Saint, was never doubted to be in Covenant with Chriſt, being of thoſe that belong to Chriſt and bear his Name, as the thing it ſelf ſpeaks, and the Evangeliſts compared ſhew, *Matth.* 10. 42. *Mar.* 9. 41. Upon converſion there was no delay of Baptiſme, as appeares through the hiſtory of the *Acts*, Chap. 2. 41. Chap. 8. ver. 12, 13. 38. Chap. 9. 18. Chap. 10. 48. Chap. 16. ver. 15, 33. Chap. 18. 8. Baptiſme inheriting the roome and honour of Circumciſion. As the Covenant gave immediate title to Circumciſion in the former diſpenſation: Now it gives the like title to Baptiſme. For the Lords Supper, it was never doubted but Chriſtians made up into Churches by this Ordinance of Baptiſme, were inrighted in it; and the Apoſtle plainely ſhewes it, 1 *Cor.* 10. 17. *For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are partakers of that one bread.* And therefore *Ravanellus in verbum Sacramentum*, inquiring into the *terminus cui*, and *cujus*, for which they are appointed, ſaies, The *terminus cui*, the end for whom they ſerve, is *ſoli fœderati*, alone perſons in Covenant; and then explaines himſelf, that [b] *All theſe are reckoned within the Covenant, that are in the external Communion of the Church; and profeſſe to beleeve in Chriſt. And ſeeing that among*

[b] Inter fœderatos autem Dei cenſentur omnes illi qui ſunt in externa Eccleſiæ Communione, et profitentur ſe in Chriſtum credere: at vero, cum inter nos quidem poſſunt eſſe Hypocritæ et impii, ideo Sacramenta in Eccleſia communia ſunt piis et impiis, ita tamen ut impii pro piis probabiliter habeantur.

thoſe there may be many hypocrites and ungodly, therefore the Sacraments in the Church are common to the godly, and ungodly; quoting 1 *Cor.* 1. 27, 29. and giving inſtance, that Circumciſion was thus conferred on *Iſhmael*, Gen. 17. 23. on *Hemor*, *Shichem*, and the men of their Cities, *Gen.* 34. 24. Baptiſme on *Simon Magus*, Acts 8. 15. and the Lords Supper on *Judas the traitour*, Luke 22. 21. When he ſaies that the Sacraments are common to the godly and wicked, he preſently inſerts indeed by way of parentheſis [*So that the wicked are probably judged to be godly;*] In which he ſeems to meane no other, but that their very profeſſion is the probability, (as ſome ſay none can conclude any profeſſour of Chriſtinity to be ungodly; there may (ſay they) be ſome ſparkes of grace under aſhes, and ſeed in due time to ſprout out, yet lying under the clods, and not appearing) elſe he contradicts himſelf in diſtinguiſhing ungodly and hypocrites aſunder, and the text alſo that he quotes; There was but little outward probability of godlineſſe in thoſe that ſo prophaned the Lords Supper, as in that chap. is held forth. And though few in their Treatiſes of the Sacraments in general, ſtand much on this particular, who they be that have their intereſt in theſe priviledges, nor do explicitely put it into the definition; yet we have it almoſt from every penne, and ſounding out of every pulpit; Are not Sacraments called ſeales, and that of Gods Covenant? are not arguments drawn in behalf of thoſe, that ſome would exclude from Sacrament priviledges, that they are *Fœderati*, and therefore ſhould be *Signati?* They are in Covenant, and therefore are entitled to the ſeales of the Covenant, which is an argument of undenyable ſtrength. So farre as a man is veſted in a grant, ſo far he is entitled to the ſeal, for ratification of it, and may require it; why is there a phraſe borrowed from theſe proceedings among men, in caſe it be not ſo here as it is in their proceedings? Look into all *Grants*, *Patents*, *Charters*, *Deeds*, *Leaſes*, *Bonds*, *Teſtaments*, you ſhall ſtill ſee the Covenant, and ſeal of equall latitude.

Here indeed is ſomewhat objected which hath over and over been anſwered.

Firſt, That ſervants bought with money, and taken into *Abrahams* family, were to be circumciſed, *Gen.* 17. 12, 13. and ſo alſo into the family of others in *Iſrael*, Exod. 12. 44.

Anſw. 1. This is ſtrangely brought to prove that men out of Covenant, ſhould be circumciſed, when the text ſaies, even of

of them, *My Covenant ſhall be in their fleſh.* Is the Covenant of God in the fleſh of thoſe that are out of Covenant?

Secondly, It is no where enjoyned to compel them to Circumciſion, nor yet is there any Example of ſuch compulſion.

Thirdly, Every Maſters duty was (as *Abrahams* practice) to Catechize their families, and ſo, not to compel them, but to invite them into Covenant. *Cajetan*,[c] as he is quoted by *Rivet* on *Exod.* 12. 43, 44. (ſuppoſing that the words ſound towards a compulſion) underſtands, *that ſervants were compelled to receive Circumciſion, but onely as a mark to diſtinguiſh them in a political way from other Nations; ſeeing it agrees not with a Sacrament as a Sacrament to be received againſt heart.* Rivets own thoughts about it may be brought into four heads. 1. That *as to the cutting off the foreskin, and the ſmart ſuffered in it, it was no injuſtice in Maſters to compell them, ſeeing they were their Money.* 2. That *he beſt approves of their opinion, That hold that the Law of circumciſing of Proſelytes was on that condition, that they were willing to be circumciſed.* 3. That *Maſters ought to make it their buſineſſe to perſwade them; but not againſt heart to circumciſe them.* 4. *If that any think that a neceſſity lay upon Maſters to circumciſe all ſervants, it is ſafeſt to be of Cajetans mind, to deny it to be any note of profeſſion of the Jewiſh Religion.*

[c] Cajetanus ergo qui neceſſitatem hanc ſuppoſuit, cum videret non convenire Sacramento qua tali, ut ab invito ſuſciperetur, exiſtimavit invitos quidem fuiſſe circumciſos ſervos, ſed ad fidei profeſſionem non fuiſſe adactos: notam vero iſtam fuiſſe, iſtis, etiam invitis impreſſam quatenus erat ſignum Reipub. politicum ſeu externum, quo Iſraelitæ ab aliis gentibus diſcernebantur.

Secondly, It is objected on the other hand, that ſome in Covenant were denyed Circumciſion; as, 1. Infants before the 8th. day: But that is unworthy of any anſwer. A ſtated day for it, is not any denyall of it. 2. Females were not to be circumciſed, ſeeing the inſtitution is onely for the males. To which three things may be anſwered. 1. For thoſe that make uſe of this objection, they have authors of their own, namely, *Walafridus Strabo de rebus Eccleſiaſticis* (as he is cited by *à Lapide* on *Geneſ.* 17.) affirming that they were circumciſed. 2. The reaſon of their excluſion from any actuall participation, was their incapacity of it. And thirdly, they were circumciſed virtually, and ſo reputed of that number, as appeares in that they were admitted to the Paſſeover,

ver, when the law was expreſſe, no uncircumciſed perſon muſt eat of it, *Exod.* 12. 48. And *Samſon* was charged that he took a wife of the uncircumciſed *Philiſtines*, Judg. 14. 3. So that I ſay, a Covenanting people of God, and they onely are entitled to the right of Sacraments; when they are given to a people out of Covenant, a ſeal is put to a blank, which muſt needs be an horrid prophanation of the ſeales of the Covenant of God. And when they are denied to thoſe in Covenant, (as not their right) they are injured from whom they are thus detayned.

SECT. II.

FOr further explanation of this point, ſeveral Propoſitions muſt be laid down.

Explicatory Propoſitions.

Propoſition. 1.

A Covenant properly ſo called is entred between God and his people.

First, *God enters a Covenant exactly and properly ſo called with his people. A Covenant in the true nature of it, paſſeth between God and man*: I took this for granted in the introduction into the Treatiſe of the Covenant of God entered with mankind, where in its proper place it might have been handled, ſuppoſing that there had been none that had denyed it; But ſince that time I have ſeen my miſtake, and among the many queſtions that have been moved and agitated about the Covenant, it is queſtioned whether there be any ſuch thing as a Covenant entered between God and any of the ſons of men upon earth? Commands and promiſes are confeſt, but a Covenant is diſputed. The way to make it good, is, to prove from Scripture the name, and the thing; when theſe are proved, all is clear. The word we find in places above number, *Deut.* 29. 12. *They ſtood that they might enter into Covenant with the Lord God.* God is often put in mind by his people of his Covenant, *Pſal.* 74. 20. and he promiſes, *Levit.* 26. 42. *to remember his Covenant.* There are then ſuch tranſactions between God and his people that are called by the name of a Covenant; when this cannot be denyed, the impropriety of the word is objected, that the word of command given of God out of Soveraignty, and the word of promiſe given

The word Covenant proved.

given out of mercy; they are called by the name of a Covenant, when ſtrictly ſo called they are (as is objected) no Covenant at all. But to avoyd this, the thing it ſelf may be as eaſily proved as the word, and when we have *nomen* and *nominis ratio-nem*, then we have a Covenant not æquivocally, but truly ſo called. And here I may deal liberally with any adverſary, and undertake to make proof not onely of all the eſſentials of a Covenant, but the uſual adjuncts: not onely all that makes up the nature, but all acceſſories uſually added to the ſolemnity of Covenants. For the eſſentials of a Covenant, or real properties, they are (as Mr. *Burges* ſaith) *A mutual conſent and ſtipulation on both ſides.* Parties, conſent, and mutual engagement is all that is required to the being of a Covenant; when two parties agree, and either of them both have their conditions to make good, there is a Covenant or bargaine; ſee it exemplified in ſeveral inſtances given, Treatiſe of the Covenant, Pag.3. All of theſe we find in that one place, *Deut.*26.17,18,19. in the Covenant that God enters with his people, *Thou haſt avouched the Lord this day to be thy God, and to walk in his wayes, and to keep his Statutes, and his Commandements, and his Judgements, and to hearken to his voyce: And the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, as he hath promiſed thee, and that thou ſhouldeſt keep all his Commandements; And to make thee high above all Nations which he hath made, in praiſe, and in name, and in honour; and that thou maieſt be an holy people unto the Lord thy God,* as he hath ſpoken. There are the Covenanters, *God* and *his people.* There is conſent on both parties, Thou haſt avouched, the Lord hath avouched. And there is a *ſtipulation* on both ſides; On Gods part, to make them high above all Nations, which he hath made, in praiſe, and in name, and in honour: On the peoples part, to keep all his Commandements, to be an holy people. There are Covenant-mercies from God to his people, unto which of grace he engages himſelf; and there are Covenant-duties unto which man ſtands engaged, *Pſal.*103.17,18. *But the mercie of the Lord is from everlaſting to everlaſting, upon them that fear him, and his righteouſneſs unto childrens children; to ſuch as keep his Covenant, and to thoſe that remember his Commandements.* Let none ſay that this was a legal Covenant, in which man had his conditions, but is freed from all in the Covenant Evangelical. Not to mention what I have elſewhere ſaid, Mr. *Ball*, Treatiſe

The thing it ſelf proved

In the eſſentialls of it.

tiſe of the Covenant, Pag.102,103,104. Mr. *Burges, Vindiciæ legis,* Pag.224,225. have abundantly manifeſted the contrary, and moſt amply of all others (that I have read) Mr. *Cobbet* in his Vindication, Pag.60, to Pag.70. where he delivers this concluſion, that *the body of the Jewiſh Church was under the Covenant of grace,* making it good with twelve arguments, and anſwering as many objections. Gods engagements in Goſpel-times none deny, mans reſtipulation is all the queſtion. And this is as clear in New Teſtament-times, as it was in the dayes of the Law; that of Chriſt fully holds it out, *Joh.*8.51. *If any man keep my ſayings, he ſhall never ſee death.* Chriſts engagement there, is to keep from death; and upon theſe termes, that man keep his ſayings: Here is a full tender of a Covenant, and Covenant-termes on Chriſts part, he that accepts of Chriſt as his Lord, and profeſſes to keep his ſayings, enters Covenant: he that hath in him ſuch an heart as God wiſhed in *Iſrael, To feare him, and keep all his Commandements alwayes,* Deut.5.29. keeps Covenant. Goſpel-Preachers hold out Chriſt in Covenant, and they do not onely tender mercies, but engage to duties: *Act.*5.31. *Him hath God exalted to be a Prince, and a Saviour, to give repentance and remiſſion of ſins*: and this duty of repentance is in order to the priviledge of remiſſion of ſins, as we find from *Peter, Act.*3.19. *Repent and be converted, th at your ſins may be blotted out:* when the duty of the Covenant is neglected, the mercy of the Covenant is loſt. This cauſed them in their Miniſtery, to be ſo zealous to urge men to it: *Teſtifying both to the Jewes, and alſo to the Greeks, repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Chriſt.*

In the uſual acceſſories on ſolemnities.

For the uſual ſolemnities of a Covenant, Theſe are found in the tranſactions between God and his people, as well as the eſſentials of it. 1. Covenants uſed to be written for memorial for poſterity, and ſo is the Covenant between God and man, as in Old, ſo in New Teſtament-times. *Theſe things are written that you might believe, and that believing you may have everlaſting life,* Joh.20.31. 2. Covenants uſed to be confirmed with *outward viſible ſignes,* as the killing of beaſts, *Jo.*15. *Jer.*34 This was done in the old adminiſtration, *Exod.*24. Half of the blood was ſprinkled upon the Altar, to denote Gods entering of Covenant, verſ. 6. The people alſo were ſprinkled with blood, to ſhew their voluntary entering into Covenant, verſ.8. And in the new diſ-

penſation, a new and unheard of ratification was uſed, the blood of the Mediatour of the Covenant, *Matth.* 26.27,28. This Cup is my blood in the New Teſtament which was ſhed for you, and for many, for the remiſſion of ſins. This latter is a plain alluſion to the former, in which you may find. 1. A threefold agreement. Either of both theſe were Covenants. 2. Either of both theſe had their ratifications and confirmations. 3. Either of both were confirmed with blood. 2. A threefold difference. 1. The former was the Old Covenant, which was antiquated; This is the New. 2. The former was ratified, and ſanctified with the blood of beaſts; This is ratified and ſanctified in the blood of Chriſt. 3. That blood could never take away ſin, *Heb.*10. This was ſhed for many, for remiſſion of ſins.

Thirdly, Covenants uſe to be confirmed by *ſeal*: ſo is this Covenant between God and his people, as remaines to be ſpoken to. As the being of a Covenant is thus plentifully proved by Scripture-teſtimony, ſo we might as amply prove it by arguments drawn from thence. The Churches of Chriſt are eſpouſed unto Chriſt, *Hoſ.*2. 19,20. And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteouſneſſe, and in judgement, and in loving kindneſs, and in mercies; I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulneſſe, and thou ſhalt know the Lord. 2 *Cor.*11.2. I have eſpouſed you to one husband, that I may preſent you to Chriſt; and Spouſes are in Covenant with their Bridegroom. The Churches of Chriſt are married to Chriſt: *Eſay* 54.5. Thy maker is thine Husband, the Lord of hoſts is his Name, and thy Redeemer the holy One of *Iſrael*, the God of the whole earth ſhall he be called. And wives are in Covenant with their husbands. Their ſins againſt God are branded with th e names of Adulteries, Whoredomes; and theſe are not barely diſobedience of a Command, or neglect of a favour, but breaches of Covenant. The Churches of Chriſt are ſervants of Chriſt, *Levit.*25. houſhold ſervants, *Epheſ.*2.19. and ſervants are their Maſters by Covenant. Their ſins in this relation are not barely obſtinacy, ſtubbornneſs, or ingratitude, but they are charged with treachery, falſehood, dealing falſely in Covenant, and their hearts being not ſtedfaſt in Covenant. It is above me to conceive, how man can be a Covenant-breaker, not alone reſpective to man, but God as he is frequently charged, when

Arguments evincing a Covenant in the proper nature of it.

when there hath paſt no Covenant between God and man. They may queſtion whether there were ever any ſuch thing as a Covenant in the world.

SECT. III.

Propoſition. 2.

SEcondly, Whereas there is an uſual diſtinction (almoſt in all that write or ſpeak of the Covenant) of a double Covenant between God and his people; one external, and the other internal; one paſſing outwardly, and the other inwardly kept and obſerved. Or (as Doctor *Preſton* expreſſeth it) a ſingle and a double Covenant, which I ſhall forbear to examine, ſeeing I know there is a right meaning; though I much doubt whether there be in the Reader a right underſtanding. My ſecond Propoſition ſhall be, that *it is the external Covenant, not the inward, that exactly and properly is called by the name of a Covenant: and to which priviledges of Ordinances and title to Sacraments are annext.* This Propoſition (occaſioned by this received diſtinction) is of three heads, which in caſe the Reader pleaſe, he may ſubdivide into three diſtinct Poſitions.

1. *The outward and not the inward Covenant is moſt exactly and properly called by the name of a Covenant*, which I thus make good: That Covenant to which the definition of a Covenant doth belong, hath exactly and properly the nature of a Covenant, this none can deny: The definition ſets out the nature of the thing defined; But the definition moſt actly belongs to the outward Covenant, not to the inward, this is plain; An agreement of parties on tearms and Propoſitions is the definition of a Covenant: Now the outward Covenant, is an agreement on tearms and Propoſitions, as elſewhere I have abundantly declared. In that Covenant God engages himſelf to man for his happineſs; and man engages to faith and obedience. The inward Covenant hath no tearms or Propoſitions at all for man to make good upon account of his Covenanting: ſeeing the performance of the conditions of the Scripture-Covenant, is his very entrance into the inward Covenant. He that believes and

The outward and not the inward Covenant, is properly a Covenant.

repents keeps Covenant, nothing more is expected of God, or promiſed by man: But believingand repenting is the firſt cloſing with God in Covenant according to them that ſpeak of an inward Covenant. A Covenant to perform conditions is a Covenant properly ſo called; But the outward Covenant, not the inward, is a Covenant to performe conditions, is plain: The conditions in the inward Covenant are the Covenant. That which confounds entrance into Covenant and keeping of Covenant, is no Covenant properly ſo called; In a Covenant properly ſo called theſe are diſtinct: But the inward Covenant confounds entrance into Covenant and keeping of Covenant, and therefore in exact propriety of ſpeech is no Covenant.

The outward Covenant is moſt uſually in Scripture called by the name of Covenant.

2. *The outward and not the inward Covenant is moſt uſually in Scripture called by the name of a Covenant*; which is plain, in that they that have no part or portion in the inward Covenant, are ſtill ſpoken of in Scripture as a people of Covenant; God calls all *Iſrael* his people, and that upon Covenant termes; ſee the place quoted, *Deut.*29.10,11,12,13. All of thoſe that there thus Covenanted with God, were not in the inward Covenant. This people at their worſt, and the worſt among them, are called the people of God, as by thoſe that were ſtrangers to this Covenant: *Theſe are the people of the Lord,* (ſay the men of *Babylon*) *and are gone forth out of his land,* Ezek.36.20. ſo alſo by the Lord himſelf, *Jer.*2.32. *Can a Bride forget her attire? yet my people have forgotten me dayes without number.* How often doth God own *Iſrael* as his people, when he yet brands them as a *rebellious, revolting, ſtiff-necked, treacherous, and adulterous people.* They that forſake the Covenant of God, that break Covenant, that deal falſely in it, upon whom God brings a ſword to avenge the quarrel of his Covenant, are in the outward, not in the inward Covenant: But ſuch there be among Gods Covenant-people, as he frequently complaines, that break Covenant, &c. Theſe are not then in his inward, but outward Covenant.

The great objection is, (and all that carries colour againſt this) *Jer.* 31.32,33. where the Lord differencing the Old and New Covenant, ſaith, *This is the Covenant that I will make with the houſe of* Iſrael, *and the houſe of* Judah: *not according to the Covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of* Egypt, *which my*

Covenant

Covenant they brake, although I was an husband to them ſaith the Lord: But this ſhall be my Covenant that I will make with the houſe of Iſrael, *After thoſe dayes ſaith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they ſhall be my people.* That is alone the inward Covenant, and the elect regenerate are alone within it. The inward Covenant then is called in Scripture a Covenant, and is in exact propriety of ſpeech a Covenant.

For anſwer, I ſhall refer the Reader to what I have ſaid, *ſcil.* Treatiſe of the Covenant, Pag. 64, 65. 66. In this place onely putting theſe Queries.

1. Whether thoſe that carry this text to an unconditionate Covenant, and reſtrain it to that which they call the inward Covenant, do not make the Covenant in the time of the Law, and that in Goſpel-times eſſentially different, and conſequently either make two Covenants of grace, diſtinct in kind; or thruſt thoſe under the Old Covenant out of all hope of ſalvation, contrary to all Interpreters, who make theſe Covenants one in ſubſtance? See the laſt larger Annotations on the words.

2. Whether ſuch an Interpretation do not utterly contradict New-Teſtament-light, which holds out the New Covenant in like latitude with the former, in which many are called, but few are choſen; and where conditions are as explicitely, and fully required, as in Old-Teſtament-diſpenſations?

3. Whether when Scripture ſpeaks of things in oppoſition to mens erroneous conceits, and for a further explanation of them, and rectifying mens judgements in them, it do uſually lay down a full compleat and formal definition, to which nothing is to be added? or whether it doth not uſually ſupply that, in which men through miſtake were defective and ſhort? And whether thoſe texts, *Eſay* 58.6,7. *Is not this the faſt that I have choſen, to looſe the bands of wickedneſſe, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppreſſed go free, and that ye break every yoak? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are caſt out into thy houſe, when thou ſeeſt the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thy ſelf from thy own fleſh?* Jer.22.15, 16. *Did not thy father eat and drink, and do juſtice and judgement, and then it was well with him? He judged the cauſe of the poor and needy, and then it was well with him; was not this to know me, ſaith the Lord?* Jam.1.27. *Pure Religion and undefiled before God and the Father*

Father is this, to viſit the fatherleſſe and widowes in their affliction, and to keep himſelf unſpotted from the world, are not parallell to this text in their way of delivery. And in caſe we cannot find a full definition of a religious Faſt in that of *Eſay*, nor the whole of it that makes up ſaving knowledge in that of *Jeremy*, nor the whole that makes religion compleat in that of *James*; why is it that we ſhould earneſtly contend, that the full nature of a Covenant is in this text expreſt, being fully parallell in the way of delivery to thoſe other texts.

Men enjoy priviledges of ordinances and intereſt in Sacraments upon account of the outward Covenant.

Thirdly, *It is upon the account of the outward Covenant, and not the inward, that men enjoy priviledges of Ordinances, and intereſt in Sacraments*; men that are ſo farre honoured as to an outward Covenant, have juſt title to theſe priviledges. It is in behalfe of the Jew outwardly that the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 3. 1. puts the queſtion; having ſo decried his condition, reſpective to the approbation of God, he objects, What advantage hath the Jew? what profit is there of Circumciſion? The Jew and Circumciſion are there one; A Jew outwardly, and Circumciſion in the fleſh go there in equal latitude. He that by nature is a Jew (as *Paul* ſpeaks, *Gal.* 2. 15.) is of the Circumciſion; And to theſe the oracles of God are committed; *The inſtruments, deeds and evidences of the Covenants*, ſay the laſt Annotations. It was the priviledg of *Iſrael*, Pſal. 147. 19. Rom. 3. and then the priviledg of no other Nation; now it is the priviledg of all engraffed in their ſtead. This is confeſt even by a great part of thoſe that underſtand the inward Covenant (or Covenant keeping to acceptation,) almoſt whenſoever they mention a Covenant, in that they baptize infants upon Covenant grounds, all their infants that make a Covenant profeſſion, and that upon juſt warranty: Scripture honouring them (as I have ſhewen) with the name of children, and ſervants of God. It is further plain in reaſon. The outward Covenant muſt have priviledges ſuitable to it, otherwiſe there is no manner of benefit or advantage of it. This priviledg of the Sacrament is ſuitable, being outward as the Covenant is outward; And it was ſufficiently cleered in the proofe of the main obſervation, where the Covenant people of God are affirmed to be the adæquate ſubject of the Sacraments, and all the Scriptures there urged, lead us to an outward Covenant, or (as ſome ſpeak) to the intereſt of an outward adminiſtration of it; So that in caſe any will contend ſtill, that it is an inward Covenant that Scripture uſually mentions and honours

with

with that title, yet being here in (as for a great part we seem) agreed, that priviledges of Sacraments are annext to the outward Covenant or outward administration, we have what we desire.

When this was almost ready for the Presse, Mr. *Baxters* Apologie came forth, in which, pag. 103. I am challenged for this distinction of an outward and inward Covenant, as though I had been the Author of it, when all know that it is a distinction, that of a long time among Divines hath been in common use; and in case it had not been commonly received, I should have forborn the use of it. As I heard *Mr. Ball* once in discourse say, that he denyed any such distinction of an outward and an inward call to the Ministery, all calling being external, unlesse the man called were a Prophet. That which men terme an inward call, being onely qualifications fitting for the work: so I deny in exact propriety of speech, that the inward Covenant is any Covenant, but the answer of the soul unto that which the Covenant requires. And whereas Mr. *Baxter* saith, *It is apparent that Mr.* Blake *distinguisheth, ex parte Dei, between the outward and the inward Covenant; It is probable that he thus distributes them, from the blessings promised, whereof some are inward, and some outward; for though he explain not himself fully, yet I know no other sense that it will bear.* I thus distinguish them, to apply my self to the Readers understanding, that hath been accustomed so to call them; and I say indeed, that men that barely Covenant, and keep not Covenant, have onely privledges that are outward, they are visible Church-members, and they have visible Church-priviledges. And those who answer to Covenant engagements (which usually is called the inward Covenant) have priviledges both outward and inward. A Jew outwardly had outward priviledges, A Jew inwardly (that is, he that answered to his outward profession, that worshipped God in his spirit) hath both those that were outward and inward. It is there said, *It is evident that his outward Covenant hath no seal; for it is a Covenant de sigillis conferendis; If therefore it have a seal, it is either the same which is promised, or some other.* What he meanes, when he saies, it is a Covenant *de sigillis conferendis*, I am to learn; If he mean that the seal followes the Covenant, and is put to after the Covenant, so it is in all Covenants whatsoever. He saies, *they no where tell us what is the seal of their outward Covenant*; me thinkes we had no need to tell what the seal of that

that Covenant was, that the Jew entred; was it not Circumciſion? and did there not another follow, *viz.* the Paſſeover? Now I tell him, that Circumciſion and the Paſſeover were, and Baptiſme and the Lords Supper are ſeales of this Covenant. The Nation of the Jewes were in Covenant, as Mr. *Baxter* (though he would, yet) muſt not deny they were in no inward Covenant; and yet they had theſe ſeales. Mr. *Baxter* ſayes, we are bound to give the ſeales to ſuch, Apolo. 88. *Vocation which is effectual onely to bring men to an outward profeſſion of ſaving faith, is larger then election, and makes men ſuch, whom we are bound to baptize;* And ſuch we ſay have right to Baptiſme. And to help Mr. *Baxter*, thoſe men that he ſaies the Church muſt baptize, though without right, we ſay are truely in Covenant, and have right; when he knowes what child he is to baptize, he knowes who we ſay are in Covenant, and have Covenant right to Baptiſme; ſo that a ſecond Covenant of which he ſpeakes to give right to a firſt, is a ſtrange fancy. But of this I ſhall have further occaſion.

SECT. IV.

Propoſition. 3.

Fundamental rihgt and priviledge of actual admiſſion to be diſtinguiſhed.

WE muſt yet diſtinguiſh between a fundamentall right, and title to the Sacraments, and the priviledg of actual admiſſion; between a firſt and ſecond right in them; between jus ad rem & jus in re. In civil titles this diſtinction holds; A child in non-nage upon his Fathers death is entitled to his inheritance; A *poſthumus* child, whoſe Parents death prevents his birth (which was the caſe of *Aſher* the ſon of *Ezron*, 1. Chron. 2. 24.) upon the firſt inſtant that he ſees the light, ſtands thus entitled, yet the law ſuffers not his admiſſion to an actual perſonall managing of it, till he be able to improve and employ it to his own and the publique benefit. The leper whom the Prieſt had pronounced unclean; ſo that he muſt dwell alone without the Camp, in a ſeveral houſe, ſevered from all company (which was the caſe of *Uzziah* King of *Judah*, 2 Chron. 21. 26. according to the law in that caſe provided, *Levit.* 13. 46.) had in the mean ſpace title

to

to his house and his whole inheritance, and upon his cleansing, was to be actually received unto it. There is a *Sequestration*, and there is a *confiscation, and proscription*. Men that are held from their estates upon just reasons, are not yet totally, and finally outed; This distinction also holds in Ecclesiasticall immunities, in that Passeover held in the Wilderness by Gods appointment, the fourteenth day of the first moneth, *there were certain men that were defiled by the dead body of a man, that they could not keep the Passeover on that day, and they came before Moses and Aaron, and said unto them, We are defiled by the dead body of a man, wherefore are we kept back, that we may not offer an offering to the Lord in his appointed season?* Numb. 9. 6, 7. They stood equally entitled with the rest of the children of *Israel* to that Ordinance, yet there was a barre in the way, that they saw, to keep them back: They therefore plead their priviledg, and hold it as a matter of grievance, that there was any obstacle in their way. This puts *Moses* to a stand, he cannot deny their right, yet by reason of the barre in the way dares not give them admission: therefore he saies, *Stand still, and I will hear what the Lord will command concerning you*, ver. 8. And the Lords order upon it was, *If any man among you, or your posterity, shall be unclean by reason of a dead body, or be in a journey, afarre off, yet shall he keep the Passeover unto the Lord, the fourteenth day of the second moneth, at even shall he keep it*, ver. 10, 11. Their right is there confessed by the Lord himself, and the present barre also acknowledged. A physicall barre is confest, when being distant in place, they cannot come; A legal barre is also confest, when in their present condition they are not fitted for it. And when some that were under this law of suspension in *Hezekiahs* time, came to the Passeover otherwise then was written, having not cleansed themselves, even many of *Ephraim, Manasseh, Issachar, and Zebulon*, *Hezekiah* prayed for them, 2 *Chron.* 30. 18, 19. *The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the Sanctuary*; The answer of the Lord we have, ver. 20. *The Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people*; which doth either imply, that they were struck of God for their sin, (as was *Abimelech*, his wife and maid servants) and were healed by *Hezekiahs* prayer, (as they by *Abrahams*) or else that by their sin they were in danger of Gods hand, and by *Hezekiahs* prayer preserved;

so that enough hath been said for this distinction between a first and second right, a fundamental right and priviledg of actual admission. There may be a true right when yet there is a barre that stands in force.

SECT. V.

Proposition. 4.

AS the fundamental right to Sacraments must be grounded on the written Word of God, so the barre to actuall admission must be written likewise. None may be admitted without known right, their visible Covenant-title must appear; in such case a seal would be put to a blank, and the Ordinance prophaned. It was therefore provided that no uncircumcised person must eat of the Passeover, *Exod.* 12.48. and none in Covenant in right, that stand in any visible relation to God, without a known barre may be kept back. There must be a reason seen of their admission, and a reason seen of their suspension. The sin of those of *Ephraim*, *Manasseh*, *Issachar*, and *Zebulon* was; that *they ate of the Passeover otherwise then was written.* There was that barre upon them, that according to the written Word they were not in present to eat of it. He that gives warranty to his people to come, must also put in the exception against those that are to be denyed. No Person, no Church must take in, or refuse by their own power; this were to Lord it over Gods heritage, and an high usurpation of a power not put into their hands. Stewards in great houses are to take in, and hold back from the family, not at their own will, but according to their Masters pleasure.

Fundamental right and bar to actual admission must be both written.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

Propoſition. 5.

THis right unto, or barre put to detain from Sacramental participation, is not alwayes explicite, and expreſſe; it is ſufficient that by a clear and full conſequence from Scripture it may be deduced. The fundamental title is clear, and before cleared. It is the Covenant that gives a title, the outward Covenant is a ſufficient title to all outward priviledges, prove a Covenant made, (kept or not kept, if not renounced) and then a right ſtands. The right unto, or barre put to preſent acceptance, is often more diſputable, which the written Word in expreſſe termes or by neceſſary conſequence muſt alſo determine. When thoſe were kept back by reaſon of a touch of a dead body, from eating the Paſſeover, *Num.*9. there was no expreſſe precept in the Law for ſuch prohibition of them; but ſeeing ſuch were to be kept out of the Campe, *Num.*5.2. and they muſt be clean that eat of the offerings of the Lord, they were evidently included, and it appears that they ſaw it. And when the Lord himſelf names thoſe barres, which in after times ſhould withhold an *Iſraelite* from the Paſſeover; the inſtances which he gives are no ſufficient explicite enumeration: It is there ſaid, that he that is in a journey could not eat of the Paſſeover, neither could he that was in priſon, or imployed in war, or under ſickneſſe: One legal uncleanneſs is there named, which did defile; there were other defilements as well as that, which diſabled an *Iſraelite* from actual participation, *Num.*5.2. Onely thoſe that inferre ſuch conſequences, muſt be able to make good their conſequences, and take heed of framing principles of their own, and then deduce conſequences from them: were this heeded, the door would not be ſet ſo wide open, as many complaine, not yet kept too narrow, as perhaps there may be cauſe of complaint, according to many mens rules, though according to their practice, perhaps there is no ſuch great cauſe of grievance; perhaps the grievance may be found on the other hand.

Right unto, or barre to detain from Sacramental participation, is not alwayes expreſt and explicite.

SECT. VII.

Propoſition. 6.

Rules for actuall admiſſion and bars put in Old Teſtament times were more explicite and expreſſe.

IN Old Teſtament-times Scripture-rules for mens actual admiſſion, and barres put to detain them, were more explicitely delivered, When men (according to the rule of the Sanctuary) were to be received, or denyed (as other circumſtances of like nature) were then more punctually delivered, and fitted to the Churches minority, which was taught, as a child with a feskue: In Goſpel-times when there is more light, and the Church hath attained further growth (as it doth not need; ſo) we do not find ſuch punctual direction. The nature and uſe of the Sacraments being known, together with the end of their inſtitution, general Scripture-rules obſerved, (that all is to be done to edification) and the end of the Miniſterial function compared, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt; It may be more eaſily collected, to whom the Sacraments may be of uſe, and to whom they will be unſerviceable.

SECT. VIII.

Propoſition. 7.

Admiſſion unto the Sacrament of initiation is facile.

THere being a double Sacrament in the Church, both in the Old and New Teſtament: one for initiation into the Church viſible, the other for confirmation: one in which it is ſufficient having a due title to be paſſive, and the other ſuch in which we muſt be active. *Admiſſion unto the Sacrament of initiation, ſeems more facile, whether it be of grown perſons in the firſt plantation of Churches, upon converſion from Gentiliſme, Judaiſme, or any other way diſtinct from Chriſtianity, or of infants that are confederate with their parents*; and though ſome lay it down as a Maxime, *Adultorum eadem eſt ratio utriuſque*, There is the ſame reaſon for admiſſion of men of years to either Sacrament; yet it is but *gratis dictum.* Neither any Scripture text, nor ſolid argument drawn from thence doth evince it. Leſſe is expected in a childs

entry

entry into the School, or a youths matriculation into the University, then in the time of growth and further proficiency. Professed Disciples are taken into the Church by Baptisme to learn; but they must be proficients as shall appear, before they are able to make improvement of the Supper.

For infants there can be no barre at all for their initiation. They that hold that Sacraments conferre grace *non ponenti obicem*, that is, upon all such that put no barre or obstacle to it, do withall conclude (and undenyably if they can make good their Position) that all infants in Baptisme, are regenerate, seeing, they put no actuall barre, either by sin or unbelieſe, to the working of it for regeneration; so we that hold that infants are confederate with their Parents, do conclude likewise, that they put no obstacle or barre to their admission to the sign or seal. As there was no further qualification required in an infant for title to Circumcision, then to be the son of an *Israelite*, or one by Circumcision joyned to *Israel*: so there was no barre by reason of uncleanneſſe, or want of previous purification mentioned either in the command given to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. or in the Law given by *Moses*, *Levit.* 12. There is mention made of the uncleanneſſe of the Mother, that hath born a man child, *Levit.* 12. 1, 2, 3. she was to continue in the blood of her purifying thirty three dayes, and to touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the Sactuary untill the dayes of her purifying be fulfilled: but nothing said of the uncleanneſs of the child, but on the eighth day the fleſh of his foreskin was to be circumcised; without mention either of uncleanneſs, or purification. Those that can find no barre in the child tendred to Baptisme, but seek for one in the Parent, to withhold it from this initiating Ordinance, may here see that when the Parent was personally polluted, the child was clean; when the Parent might touch no hollowed thing, the child was yet to be circumcised. And moral uncleanneſſe in the Parent can have no more influence on the child, to indispose for this priviledge, then legal, when according to themselves Original sin (though transfused by the Parent into the child) is no barre. In vain do they make the Parents actual sins an obstacle, which is terminated in the Parent as defiling the person, but transmitting no blot to posterity. It is a most un-Scriptural way in those, that in their judgement are for Pædo baptisme, to inhibite the tender of infants, upon pretence of either their

There is no barre to the initiation of infants in confederation on with their Parents.

their Parents ſin, or their want of Congregational membership. And here that ſuppoſed great argument, to debarre the infants of ignorant and ſcandalous perſons from Baptiſme, may have an eaſie anſwer; *Such Parents, if they were now to be Baptized, ought not to be Baptized*; Ergo *they cannot challenge it for their children*; *Baptiſme belongs primarily to the Parent.* The conſequence is here manifeſtly falſe, ſeeing ſuch Parents have unqueſtionably a fundamental firſt right, both to Baptiſme and the Lords Supper, in their reſpective order, by virtue of their profeſſion of the worſhip of God in Chriſt as their God, in oppoſition to all falſe gods; and their profeſſion of the wayes of Chriſtianity, in oppoſition to all other wayes; though their ignorance and ſcandal do prove a barre to their preſent admiſſion to either, and having this right, and being to be Baptized, their children with them are enrighted; and children putting in no barre, may be actually admitted. Priviledges in Church, and Common-Wealth, are *ex traduce*, and ſo are not crimes. In this I have delivered my ſelf, I treatiſe of the Covenant, *chap.* 46. as alſo in my Birth-priviledge, making good this poſition by ſeveral arguments, *That the children of all that by profeſſion are Chriſtian, are by virtue of Covenant-intereſt to be received into the Church by Baptiſme*; Enlarging my ſelf in ſeveral particular inſtances, in ſuch whoſe ſeed ſome would debarre, which yet according to Scripture rules we ought to receive; Examining Mr. *Firmins* grounds to the contrary *in his ſerious queſtion ſtated*; And anſwering his arguments, he hath been pleaſed in one day to read, and undertake to refute what I have ſpoke. He muſt therefore give his Reader leave, from his own mouth, to believe that it is a very haſty birth, and what need there is that he ſhould yet lick it over, the work it ſelf will ſpeak. I little expected (I confeſſe) ſo unfair dealing from a man of his candour, he might eaſily have ſeen that all that I ſpeak to him in this thing there, is by way of Corollarie or inference drawn from that which by Scripture-teſtimony, and arguments in ſeveral foregoing Chapters I had made good. Which (as it appears from his own hand) when his refutation came out, he had never read, and therefore (by his own acknowledgement) hath taken my concluſion into conſideration, having never ſeen the premiſes, and ſo muſt judge according to his own reaſon, onely having never had any ſight of mine. Before I come to give anſwer to his

Mr. *Firmins* appendix as to the latitude of infant-Baptiſme examined.

excep-

exceptions againſt that which this Poſition affirmes, I muſt clear my ſelf from ſome imputations of his, touching my dealing with him. *I obſerve ſometimes* (ſaith he) *you dreſſe my argument in ſuch a faſhion, that I cannot know it to be mine, but diſclaime it, then you find fault.*

The Author cleared from ſome imputations.

To give the Reader here an account, Mr. *Firmin* had framed this argument againſt the power of mediate Parents to conferre Baptiſme on poſterity; *If that promiſe doth give this power to predeceſſours, then though there were none to educate this child (for the ignorant and prophane Parents will not, but teach them how to break Covenant; predeceſſours cannot, they are dead, and are not) yet we muſt ſeal to the child.* Having explained my ſelf to avoid miſtake, I firſt anſwer, that Mr. *Firmin* himſelf here concludes ſuch a childs intereſt. In caſe he can be brought to break Covenant, he is intereſſed in the priviledges of the Covenant; to which he ſayes nothing at all, but either in haſte or prudence paſſeth it by, and dealing with Mr. *Caudrey* ſpeaks fully to confirm the ſtrength of it: *Intereſt in the Covenant of the Goſpel* (he ſaith, Pag. 4.) *gives firſt right to Baptiſme.* This child hath this intereſt, otherwiſe he can be in no capacity to break Covenant, he hath therefore this firſt right, and let Mr. *F.* ſee how he can deny an infant the ſecond. I add in the ſecond place, let him make it up into a formal argument, and then it runs thus: That child whoſe immediate Parents will not bring it up to the power of Godlineſs, hath no right to Baptiſme. Here his exception lyes, and therefore he demands, *Where have I mentioned the power of Godlineſſe, as a requiſite in him who claimes Baptiſme? but to bring up a child in it, is a harder matter.* To which I reply, 1. That here is a ſtrange queſtion, ſeeing we were not ſpeaking to any prerequiſite for Baptiſme, but after education, which was his exception. 2. Though he mentions not education in the power of godlineſſe in words; yet in caſe his meaning be not ſo, his argument anſwers it ſelf; For the child of ſuch a parent that he mentions, ſhall infallibly (ſo farre as man can judge) have education in a way of Chriſtianity, ſo farre as to be of the Society of profeſſed Chriſtians, under the diſpenſation of thoſe Ordinances that are able to ſave the ſoul, and are called by the Apoſtle the power of God to ſalvation, *Rom.* 1. 16. He further addes, *Sometimes your anſwer is a bare laying down your own judgement, with a ſimilitude added for illuſtration*, quoting pag. 441. He addes,

We

we call for Scripture and reason, Similia ad pompam non ad pugnam. This that he relates unto was thus occasioned: In his serious Question stated, pag. 8. he saith, *If the predecessour may by this promise give right to Baptisme without the immediate parent, then I pray tell us how farre we may go for this predecessour? how many generations? where hath Gods Word limitted Ministers? you may go to this predecessour, and no further.* After that I had replied, that I knew but few that say the predecessour gives right, without the immediate parent, but all concurre in a joynt way to communicate a Covenant interest; I there for further satisfaction of his Question demand, in titles of honour and inheritance of Lands which men claim by descent from their Ancestors, where is it that they will stay? adding that it will soon be answered, that they stay, when they can go no higher, to find out any other predecessor vested in such honour, or inheritance; and then I bring it home by applicatian of Scripture instances, full to our purpose. Some can make no claime at all from parents, they are the first of their house in honour or inheritance; and this was the case of *Abraham*, he had no interest in Covenant from *Terah*; such was the case of the primitive converts; and such is the case of the Indians, that now by a gracious providence are converted by the *English*. Some can go no further then their immediate parents, they were the first in honour, or that gained an inheritance to their house; This was the case of *Isaac* and those children called by the Apostle, holy, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. and will be the case of the children of Indian converts. Others can rise to the third or fourth generation; others can go as high as the conquest; some can claime beyond the conquest, by Deeds without date: so it is with Christians, they may go as high as Ancestors have been in Christianity. I here demand, whether there be not reason in this parallel, seeing Christian priviledges (as I have proved at large, and he never denyed) are descendable from parent to child, as are honours and inheritances, and whether Scripture be wanting in that answer? I had proved at large, pag. 436. that mediate parents give this right: and I appeal now to the Reader, whether that question of his, *Where we may stay?* hath not a sufficient answer both from Scripture and reason, so that he might have spared his call for it?

I tell Mr. *F.* that his first argument brought for the exclusion of infants of ignorant and scandalous persons from Baptisme managed

managed in the way that he doth, was Mr. *Blackwoods* argument before him, to debarre all Infants from Baptiſme, putting his own *Medium* into Syllogiſticall forme againſt him, with equall force concluding againſt all Infant-Baptiſme, which he ſaies, *Sir, is no clever way of diſputation*, pag. 53. Then I am to learn how to diſpute cleverly, if I may not deal by retortion againſt a man, with his own weapon: did not Chriſt diſpute in a clever way with the Phariſees, when they charged him to caſt out devills by *Beelzebub*? anſwering them, *By whom then do your children caſt them out*? Matth. 12. 27. He anſweres for himſelf, *that he never ſaw any thing of* Mr. *Blackwoods*, and I never had it in my thoughts to charge him with borrowing from him, but onely to ſhew him that either his arguments might have an anſwer, or elſe he muſt deny Baptiſme to all Infants, which is againſt both his own judgement, and practice. He tells me that Mr. *Johnſon hath anſwered the argument before me, and I in his words, though he ſaies, it may be I ſaw him not*, which to me is ſtrange, that we ſhould ſo hit in one, I having ſeen no more of Mr. *Johnſon* then he hath done of Mr. *Blackwood*; but it is worth the obſerving how he goes about to avoid it, as turned againſt himſelf; For he knew well that I brought it not as an argument *ad rem*, (for he ſaies, I have anſwered it) but *ad hominem*. His argument is this, pag. 18. of his Serious queſtion, *Such perſons as de jure ought, and de facto are excluded by godly Miniſters from the Lords Supper, ought alſo to be excluded from their childrens Baptiſme: But ſuch perſons as the queſtion mentions, de jure ought, and de facto are excluded from the Lords Supper*: Ergo. The Major he proves thus, *If Baptiſme doth ſeal to the ſame Covenant, which the Lords Supper doth, and doth ſignifie and ſeal as great bleſſings and priviledges, as the Lords Supper doth, then thoſe who are excluded from the Lords Supper, ought alſo to be excluded from their childrens Baptiſme: But the antecedent is true: Ergo the conſequent is true.* This in Mr. *Blackwoods* behalfe I thus urge againſt him, If Baptiſme doth ſeal to the ſame Covenant, which the Lords Supper doth, and doth ſignifie and ſeal, as great bleſſings, and priviledges as the Lords Supper doth, then thoſe that are excluded from the Lords Supper ought alſo to be excluded from Baptiſme: But all Infants are excluded from the Lords Supper *eo nomine* becauſe they are Infants; and therefore they are to be excluded from Baptiſme. Further adding, when Mr. *Firmin* hath given a fair, and

a full anſwer to this Syllogiſme, he may eaſily fit it to his own, to give like ſatisfaction.

All his anſwer is, *My argument is not hurt at all, though the parent may be ſuſpended for a time, what is this to the ſuſpenſion of three parts of a Church, ſix or ten yeares together, and never proceed further?* And I ſay, what is this to the purpoſe? Though parents be ſuſpended all their daies, whether juſtly, or injuriouſly, root and branch are not therefore under ſuſpenſion.

Words of mine, pag. 426, 424. he challenges: *Infants of parents that are nomine tenus Chriſtians have right to Baptiſme, if they profeſſe the worſhip of the true God, though nothing more of a Chriſtian be in them.* In which how much my words are curtailed, for haſte, I leave to the Reader, by comparing to find out.

For anſwer, He ſpeakes firſt by way of conceſſion, *I make no queſtion but many ſuch nominal ones a Miniſter may baptize, and their children, though they have not truth of grace in them*; and goes on, *But I perceive your ſcope is to ſpread the Word very large, and that directly oppoſite to my queſtion; If they will ſay they are Chriſtians, bear the Name of Chriſt, own his worſhip (though it be but from the cuſtome of the Nation, others do ſo, and ſo do they) though their courſe and frame of converſation be like the infidels, or worſe, yet they are Chriſtians nomine tenus, hence we muſt baptize if they have but fides, no matter for obſervation.* The great fault is, it ſeemes, that I preſume to go oppoſite to his queſtion, which I muſt ingenuouſly acknowledge; but ſeeing I am allowed to baptize both parent and child, where there is no truth of grace in the parent, and yet am chidden for being too large, I demand when I muſt ſtay? in what latitude I may walk? Men of the Congregational way are wont to limit me to parents one or both of the truth of grace, and will allow none but beleevers children; If juſtifying faith be not in the parent, no baptiſmal water ſhall come on the child. All other Chriſtians from the beginning of Chriſtianity (thoſe excepted that as of yeſterday have oppoſed infant Baptiſme) look upon them under what notion you will, have allowed to go as farre as profeſſion of Chriſtianity. Mr. *Firmin* that will be larger then the one, and narrower then the other, muſt tell us where we muſt fix. He hath my rule to except againſt, I have not his to challenge. To let me underſtand my error in being

too

too large, he demands, *But, Sir, I pray what if they be heretical about the natures of Chriſt, as of old ſome deny the humanity of Chriſt, and ſome the Deity of Chriſt?* and then proceeds to further inſtances. To which I firſt anſwer, Perhaps he may find ſome called Chriſtians, that it is a contradiction *in adjecto* to name them ſo, ſuch that receive not the Goſpel at all, but profeſſedly abhorre it. If any ſuch are intended, I ſhall ſay my meaning is known. They that are no Turkes, Infidels, Pagans, but in oppoſition to them of the faith, worſhip, and way, that is Chriſtian. Secondly, For the Heretiques inſtanced in, ſuch as were of old, Mr. *Firmin* being ſo well verſt in the way of antiquity, I wiſh him to enquire what the Orthodox thought in thoſe times of their Baptiſme? Did they rebaptize thoſe that had received their Baptiſme? Did they deny their infants Baptiſme? They were to be trained to hear that Word that was able to convince this error: And how much worſe, reſpective to ſalvation, were theſe tenents, then that of the denyall of the reſurrection? yet the Infants of ſom ſuch were circumciſed, (as I have ſhewen) and of others baptized. He goes on: *What if they think Chriſt was a Woman?* as (he ſaies) *he hath given inſtance in one*; And indeed a wild one, of one who had a prayer where this was often repeated, that *Jeſus was her name*; perhaps he was a Welſh-man, and then (according to their dialect) *her* is the Maſculine gender. This indeed were an error, full of folly, but not of ſuch danger, for two reaſons. 1. Chriſt were yet of mankind, and had taken our nature, had he been of that ſex. 2. It were not likely that he ſhould make over ſuch an opinion to his poſterity: He leaves hereſy, (which he might have ſpared, ſuch ſhunne our Congregations) and falls to inſtance in ignorance *What if he knew not whether he was God or man, as before? what: if ten Gods?* with abundance ſuch ſtuffe. I ſay, the caſe of ſuch is ſad, & more ſad in the degree, then I have met with any of the uſe of reaſon, and in capacity for marriage ſociety. I wiſh from my ſoul that all meanes were ſought that theſe blind might ſee; yet as long as God is not hereby provoked to remove our Candleſtick, but light ſtill ſhines in our Horizon, the Kingdome of God being not yet removed; ſo that when the parent is blind, the child may ſee, as I have known many happy experiences, yea, the ignorant parents glorying in it. There is not cauſe that we ſhould be more ſevere then the Lord himſelf, as to thruſt out their poſterity from the ſociety of the Lords people. This

were to provoke them to shut their eyes, and not to open them to receive the light that shines about them; I think it were to exceed in our zeal against ignorance, as farre as the disciples did against the *Samaritanes*, when they would have *fire to come down from heaven to consume them*, Luke. 9. 54. I had instanced in ignorance in Church-members, not onely among the Jewes, but Christians, as the *Hebrewes*, Heb. 5. 12. the *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. 15. 34. That of the *Hebrewes*, he saies, *he thinkes hurts him not; That of the* 1 Cor. 15. 34. (he saies) *is most likely*, when I know not whether of these two is more likely. To that concerning the *Corinthians*, *some have not the knowledg of God, I speak this to your shame*, (which he onely thinkes is worthy of an answer) he saies, 1. *Sir, do you think it was such grosse ignorance as I have given instance?* To which I answere, 1. That I know no more then the Apostle tells me, and he saies it was want of the knowledge of God. 2. I demand, will you allow me to baptize the children of those that I find not equalling such in ignorance that you mention, *viz.* the children of all that know that God is one, and the Commandements tenne? 2. He demands, *Was not Paul as true to his work as Abraham or the Jewes were to be in admitting to Circumcision? which I mention*, pag. 445. To which I say, I do not think that the admission of all was *Pauls* work, and that many were admitted, after he left them, before he wrote this Epistle to them. 2. I know he admitted few among them, their admission was by Baptisme; and how many, or (if you will) how few he baptized in *Corinth*, you may learn from himself, 1 *Cor.* 1. 14, 16. 3. He saies, *I have found so much ignorance that the persons deserved shame, but yet dared not to keep them from the Lords Supper, because I found such a work on their heart, though they could not expresse it in a definition.* To which I say, that I find so much ignorance in my self that deserves shame, and such that may not be able to expresse the thing that might be in question, might passe with me, for knowing men; *Periti est artificis definire*; But were they such that you could say to their shame, that they had not the knowledge of God? and yet durst you not exclude them from the Lords Supper? He tells us of many sad instances of ignorance in fathers, upon which he refuseth to give admission to infants; But were it granted that such, as to all priviledges were meer heathens, as it was with those in *Corinth* mentioned by the Apostle that were joyned in marriage with believers, and their ignorance

not

not onely groſſe, but total, and in all reſpects to be reckoned among thoſe that were without God in the world (as I ſhall not yeeld as long as the candleſtick is not removed,) yet I do not hear that he makes any enquiry after the mothers of thoſe infants; that he takes the paines to go to them in Child-bed, to demand any account of their proficiency: perhaps they might give as good an account, as ſome that he ſaies he durſt not keep from the Lords Table. And then as in the Apoſtles judgement, they ſanctifie their husbands in unbelief, as to the producing of an holy ſeed, being no profeſſed infidels, but in name Chriſtians: So according to his own judgement, as to that end, they ſanctify their husbands in ignorance, being ſo far knowing Chriſtians.

SECT. IX.

The ſeventh Propoſition enlarged.

Admiſſion of men of years examined.

AS for thoſe that are of years, though we are not much concerned, ſcarce one unbaptized Perſon in an age, being tendred to us, yet it is not meet wholly to omit it; when any in the Primitive times upon the Preaching of the Apoſtles was ready to profeſſe, and willing to engage in a way of Chriſtianity, he was ſtreight (according to the order of Chriſt) to be admitted by Baptiſme: the Commiſſion it ſelf ſpeaks thus much; Diſciple all Nations, baptizing them is the charge; being diſcipled there needs no further enquiry, and accordingly was the practice; the *Eunuch* upon profeſſion of faith, and water at hand was preſently baptized by *Philip*, *Act.* 8. and the *Jaylour* the ſelf ſame hour that he was converted, was baptized by *Paul* and *Silas*, *Act.* 16. Thoſe that limit Baptiſme to years of diſcretion, appear to be wholly of this mind; Mr. *Tombes*, *Examen.* Pag. 159. is clear, that *profeſſion of faith, and holineſſe is ſufficient warrant to baptize.* And for their practice, let their Proſelytes whereſoever they prevail ſpeak, when ſuch as we ſee are admitted, we may well conclude, that in their judgement none are to be refuſed. There are others that ſet up a new Church-door, having diſcipled any in their way, they do not (as Chriſt enjoyned

ned concerning unbaptized Heathens, or as others, concerning baptized Chriſtians) baptize them, but they tender a Covenant of Church-fellowſhip unto them, and that is their way of Church entrance, when yet their infants keep the old rode of Baptiſme.

Admiſſion unto a Church-Covenant and member ſhip looked into.

Theſe at leaſt ſome of them, are exceeding ſtrict, and will have none admitted but thoſe that the quickeſt ſighthed, Eagle-eyed Chriſtians judge (ſo farre as they are able to apprehend) to have both name, and thing of Chriſtianity. And to add honour to this way, the world muſt be born in hand, and that with atteſtation of no mean ones, that *the converſion of the* Gentiles, and Jewes, in that infinite number as we read in the *Acts* of the Apoſtles, *was all in reality, and that the whole Church of Hieruſalem,* (conſiſting at leaſt of eight thouſand members) *was an homogeneal body, under the ſame light, conſcience and tenderneſſe*; Of a more noble homogeneity, and more pure conſtitution ſure then ever came into Chriſts thoughts, to ſee his Kingdom attain unto upon earth: He compares it to a field made up of a mixture of Tares and Wheat, *Matth.* 13.24. to a Draw-net caſt into the Sea, which taketh fiſhes of all kinds, both good and bad, *Matth* 13.47. And in the cloſe o. two other Parables inferres, *that many are called, but few are choſen,* Matth.20.16. Matth.22. 14. This he ſpake in the ears of his Diſciples; and we may wonder if they ſhould live to ſee it contradicted. He tells his hearers, *Luk.*9.27. *Matth.* 16.18. *There be ſome ſtanding here, which ſhall not taſte of death till they ſee the Kindgom of God.* And can we think, that he underſtood a Kingdom in that reſplendent glory, which he had ever denyed, when he made it his buſineſs to decipher and hold it forth unto them? When they heare of it, they hear of a field with tares and wheat, of a draw-net with fiſh of all ſorts; They live to ſee flouriſhing fields of pure wheat, full nets of fiſhes that are onely good; being told that many are called but few choſen, they yet ſee myriads of thouſands called and all choſen. Yea, *Paul* after he had ſeen the contrary, and gained fellowſhip (according to theſe men in ſuch an homogeneal pure body) ſtill ſymbolizes in like Parables, of *a great houſe that had veſſels, ſome to honour, and ſome to diſhonour,* 2 Tim.2.20. applying it to the Elect and Reprobate in the Church of God. We are told that *the complexion of a viſible Church under the Goſpel is converſion; the conſtituted matter, converted*

verted ones; and that this soul-complexion is the same in the whole body, members having received the same Spirit of Adoption, owning and experiencing the same grace of God. But it is plain that Christ did neither see, nor foresee any such purity of complexion, nor can they that look upon Primitive Churches in the glasse of Scriptures see any more then Christ did discover. Those words of *Luke*, Act. 15. 3. *And being brought on their way by the Church, they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles, and they caused great joy unto all the brethren*, is made a fundamental ground-work of this building of such glory, as though all conversion by the Word were attended by the changing work of the Spirit; which happy glosse (in case it would hold) would turne all the grounds in the parable into good ground, and a convert or proselyte in an historical narrative, would ever be the same with elect or regenerate. But the words going before, and following these (if they may be but taken in) will serve to spoil all this supposed glory and purity. A sect riseth up and teacheth the Brethren, that *except they be circumcised after the manner of Moses they cannot be saved*, and what manner of men they were, and how their Doctrine took, we may read in *Pauls* Epistles to the *Philippians*, *Colossians*, and especially in that to the Churches of *Galatia*; it almost wrought to the apostatizing of those Churches from the faith of Christ to another Gospel. If ever these were one homogeneal body, respective to soul complexion; an abundant proof is given in against the Saints perseverance and for their falling from grace, *Paul* was not so enamoured with their beauty, when he tells them that *he is afraid of them, and travells again in birth of them*. And whether he had such high thoughts of the *Corinthians*, let sundry passages in his Epistles to them witnesse. Great complexion spots may be seen, 1 *Cor.* Chap. 3. 3. Chap. 6. 8 Chap. 11. 18, 19, 21. Chap. 15. 12, 34. 2 *Cor.* 12. 20, 21. So that it is plain, that in primitive times Jewes and Pagans, being wrought upon (by the Word heard, and miracles seen) to make profession of, and engage to a Christian faith and life, were upon that account received: of which, as some had hearts sincere towards Christ, so many were otherwise. Through the whole Scripture there is no demurre put to the Baptisme of any who made profession of the Name of Christ, save *Saul*, concerning whom *Ananias* (being warned of God to go to him, and conferre sight upon him, being struck blind)

objectes,

objects, *the evil that he had done to the Saints at Hieruſalem; and that he had at preſent, authority from the Chief Prieſts, to bind all that called on the Name of Chriſt*, Acts 9. 13, 14. And when he afterwards aſſayed to joyn himſelf to the diſciples that were at *Hieruſalem*, they were all (upon that account) afraid of him. Neither *Ananias* at *Damaſcus*, nor the Church at *Hieruſalem*, did put his ſincerity in grace to the queſtion, upon that account they might have challenged thouſands of others; But they feared, that he onely pretended converſion, upon a deſign to advance his way of perſecution. Let Mr. *Cobbet* from *New England* in this particulur be heard, who laies down this concluſion, That *the Church in diſpenſing an enjoyned initiatory ſeal of the Covenant of grace, looketh into viſibility of intereſt in the Covenant to guide her in the application thereof, nor is the ſaving intereſt of the perſons her rule by which ſhe is to proceed.* There, we find in the affirmative, what that is that muſt lead, *viz. viſibility of intereſt in the Covenant*, and in the negative, what muſt not lead, and that is, *ſaving intereſt in the Covenant*. And viſibility of intereſt is certainly theirs, who profeſſe Chriſt, engage for Chriſt, and avouch themſelves to be for him, unleſſe we will utterly confound Covenant entring, and Covenant keeping, which Scripture ſo carefully diſtinguiſhes. I know Mr. *Firmin* in his reply to Mr. *Cauldry* ſpeaking of Scandalous perſons, pag. 4. ſaith, *According to our Congregational principles, that which gives a man the firſt right to a Sacrament, viz. his intereſt in the Covenant of the Goſpel, this man hath not; for he doth viſibly declare to the Churches, that he hath no intereſt in the Covenant.* That intereſt in the Covenant of the Goſpell gives a man the firſt right to a Sacrament, we willingly imbrace; but that cenſure of ſcandalous perſons, that they viſibly declare to the Churches, that they have no intereſt in the Covenant, we muſt reject, as evidently contrary to Scripture principles. *Iſrael*, of whom *Moſes* gave that teſtimony, that *the Lord had not given them an heart to perceive, and eyes to ſee, or eares to hear*, ſpeaking of the generality of them, had ſome that might have been judged ſcandalous, yet they all of them even then entred Covenant with God, *Captaines of their tribes, Elders, Officers, even all the men of Iſrael, from the hewer of wood, to the drawer of water*, Deut. 29. 10, 11. Thoſe that God owns as his people in Covenant, and calls by the name of his people, I ſhall take to have intereſt in the Covenant, though thouſands ſay

Mr. F. appendix as to the admiſſion of men of years examined.

ſay the contrary: But God ownes theſe as his people, reſpective to Covenant intereſt; they that did *ſteal, murder, commit adultery, ſweare falſely, burne incenſe to other gods, and walk after other gods*, all men would judge to be ſcandalous, yet ſuch come, and ſtand before the Lord in his houſe, and profeſſe themſelves to be his people in Covenant, and whether or no God doth not ſo eſteem them, let his own mouth ſpeak, *Jer.* 7. 12. Chap. 6. 26. Chap. 8. 11. The Vineyard of the Lord conſiſts of a people in viſible Covenant, yet with theſe we find not a few ſcandals and ſcandalous ones, as *Iſay* 5. is manifeſt; ſee, *Hoſ.* 4. 6, 12. *My people are deſtroyed for lack of knowledg: my people aske counſel at their ſtockes and their ſtaffe, declareth unto them, for the ſpirit of whoredome hath cauſed them to erre, and they have gone a whoring from under their God.* Shall we ſay they were not Gods people, or ſhall we ſay that theſe were no ſcandals? to put all out of queſtion, the Apoſtle tells us, *Rom.* 9. 2, 3. that intereſt in the Covenant pertaines to all *Iſrael* after the fleſh, neither is it any otherwiſe in Goſpel times, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. *If any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or Covetous, or an Idolater, or a rayler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner*, &c. he that is called a brother is viſibly in Covenant, but ſuch a one (we ſee) may be ſcandalous. The ſeven Golden Candleſticks are the ſeven Churches, amidſt which Chriſt walkes, and whether there were not ſcandals among theſe, read the Epiſtles to them. If viſible intereſt in Covenant give a firſt right. then theſe undoubtedly may claime it, their firſt right (according to the forementioned principle) is undoubted; and for actuall admiſſion (as well as the firſt right) to the Sacrament of initiation, let the ſame Mr. *Cobbet* ſpeak; *John Baptiſt did, and lawfully might baptize thoſe multitudes, albeit in the general he knew that many, yea, moſt of them would prove falſe, and frothy* quoting, *Matth.* 3. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. and afterward, *Albeit, we may think in the general that to be ſure in all viſible Churches there will be ſome veſſels of diſhonour ſometimes, yet Miniſters which are the Churches as well as Chriſts ſervants, are not therefore to refuſe to diſpenſe Church ordinances ſince, they are in the face of the Church ſuch utenſills as the Lord may have and hath need of. Hence the Apoſtles (which are extraordinary perſons knew the guile of perſons ſecret from the Church. witneſſe, that act againſt Ananias and Sapphira*, Acts 5. 1; &c.) *yet in adminiſtring the Church ſeal of Baptiſme they refuſed not Ananias and Sapphira*

no, nor Simon Magnus, Acts 8. *Nor thouſands of other of the Jewes, amongſt whom how many proved falſe?* Acts 2. 41. *and* 4. 1, 2, 3, 4. compared. 21. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 30, 31, 36. *and* 22. 20, 22 *and* 23. 12, 13. *witneſſe.* So that we ſee Scripture gives precedents (if we judge them ſafe to follow) of a very facile admiſſion of thoſe that profeſſe and manifeſt their willingneſſe to engage in Chriſtian waies.

Mr. *Firmin* ſaies, *If a bare profeſſion of faith in Chriſt be ſufficient to make a member of a Church, then no perſon can be juſtly excommunicated out of a Church, for the vileſt ſinnes or hereſies, provided he doth but hold this profeſſion of his faith: The conſequence is cleere, the perſon is the ſame now, which he was when you took him into the Church.* To this I have anſwered, pag. 449. The conſequence is cleerly erroneous, for he made a profeſſion of his faith and not of his ſin. To this Mr. *Firmin* replyes, *Then it ſeemes the man muſt profeſſe his ſin with his own mouth, as his faith, though Mr.* Blake *knowes he is a ranter, &c. The members of the Church witneſſe it, yet becauſe the mans own mouth doth not profeſſe it, you admit him.* I deſire to know where witneſſes were called in for this purpoſe to ſpeake what they had to ſay againſt ſuch and ſuch a mans admiſſion to Baptiſme, as now by an inſtrument affixt on the door of the publique place of meeting men are called to except, (in caſe they have any thing to ſpeak) againſt Miniſters ordination. Had *Paul* and *Silas* nothing againſt the Jaylour at *Philippi?* who was ſo ſerviceable to thoſe in power, that he thruſt them into the inward priſon, and made their feet faſt in the ſtockes, *Acts* 16. 24. And wheras our author ſaies elſewhere, that *there was a legal work on his conſcience,* ſo there is many a time on mariners in a ſea ſtorm, which a calme will ſuddenly quiet. Can he imagine that the lives of all the people, even the Publicanes and harlots that *John* baptized (*Matth.* 21. 31. Luke 7. 29. compared) were ſo inoffenſive, that none could ſay black to their eye? whatſoever *John* knew (in caſe they had been called in and heard,) ſome could have ſaid ſomewhat againſt theſe Publicanes and harlots, and yet even theſe were admitted. As to that which followes, *Then, Sir, though you know the ſame abominations afterwards, and your members teſtifie it, witneſſes come in you muſt not caſt him out, unleſſe he will profeſſe it.* Though he is pleaſed to ſay that this argument will coſt me more then two lines, before it be anſwered, yet a few words will ſhew that it is a meer *non ſequitur.*

sequitur. If a man make it his request, upon the fame that he hath heard, and the good that he hath seen in Mr. *Firmins* Family, to be admitted to serve him in it, confessing his wayes to have been bad, but now professes that he is resolved upon a new way, and in order to it, desires to be received into such a Society, where godlinesse may be learnt, may not he now admit him? and may he not afterwards upon breach of this engagement dismisse him? I will averre my similitude to be fit, yet I confesse it is not full; for when Mr. *Firmin* hath dismissed this servant, and put him out of doores, he hath now no more relation to him. But when a man upon profession to be for God, is once in Covenant, though his wickednesse deserves that the priviledges of the family should be denyed, yet he is still in Covenant, though under breach of Covenant, and stands related to the Church of God in title, otherwise, upon his repentance he must have a new admission by Baptisme. The Church, I say, may receive a man upon engagement of amendment, (which must be done in baptisme) to be baptized, and upon his return to wickednesse Excommunicate him: His profession gives him right to Baptisme, and his sin deserves excommunication. He tells us, Though we read not that *Philip* required repentance, yet others did: But did they so require it, as in reality to precede baptisme? Or were they satisfied with a profession of it? If they so required it as in reality to precede, they then must give a day over to give evidence of it; and whether this was the manner in *Johns* baptisme, in *Philips*, or the Apostles, let adversaries be Judges.

I cannot tell what should move Mr. *F.* when he had given me thanks, pag. 54. for my courteous handling of him without scorn, to adde in the next page, *Sir, I thought Christianity had taken in the heart, and outward conversation as well as the head; a real Christian is one united to Christ, sound in the doctrine concerning Christ, and walking as Christ did* [*we suppose an old Adam*]. *Let him who is a nominal Christian appear like one, though he be not real.* And I do think that it is little below a scorn, to bear the world in hand that I think otherwise; what have I said for him to Sir me in this particular? perhaps becauſe I somewhere speak of a profession of faith, not mentioning repentance; so he may challenge *Philip* to be defective, who when the *Eunuch* demanded, *What doth hinder me to be baptized?* answered, *If thou beliest*

veſt with all thine heart thou mayeſt, Act. 8. 37. And *Paul* and *Silas* likewiſe, who when the *Jaylour* ask'd, *What ſhall I do to be ſaved?* anſwered as we know, *Believe in the Lord Jeſus, and thou ſhalt be ſaved, and thine houſhold*; Nay, will not the ſame charge fall upon the head of our Saviour himſelf, who in his Commiſſion to the Apoſtles, ſaith, *He that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved?* None of theſe mention repentance; what can be ſaid for them, will excuſe me: I am ſo far from being againſt repentance in a Chriſtian, that I expect ſome will think that I have ſaid too much for the neceſſity of it, and put too high an honour upon it. He proceeds farther, and ſaith, *Let us view the Scripture in adminiſtration of Baptiſme*, Mar. 4. *Baptiſme of Repentance, that is more then Faith.* More explicitely, but no more implicitely. Faith takes Chriſt to give repentance, as well as a Saviour to give remiſſion of ſins. *They confeſſed their ſins*, ſaith he. 1. Some will have it to imply no verbal confeſſion, but virtual, coming for baptiſme for remiſſion of ſins, it was an acknowledgment that they were guilty; which gloſſe carries ſtrong probability with it, in regard of the multitude, that in ſo ſhort a ſpace were baptized. 2. I require more, an engagement to leave ſin, which their taking upon them the Name of Chriſt doth imply, 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. *Let every one that nameth the Name of Chriſt depart from iniquity.* He goes on, *Acts* 2. 37, 38. *Firſt Jewes ſo had knowledge not ſo ignorant as ours* I believe. The Reader may believe the contrary, till he ſee ſome proof. *Secondly, having a legal work by the power of the Word:* They that had crucified Chriſt as a blaſphemer, deceiver, muſt needs have ſome work upon them before they would take him profeſſedly for a Saviour. *Thirdly, Receiving the Word*; That implies no more then giving credit to what the Apoſtle ſpake, that Jeſus whom they had crucified was Lord and Chriſt. *Fourthly, Repenting they are baptized, this is more ſtill.* And more then is expreſt in the Text. Baptiſme in his Name doth indeed imply, that now they repented that they had crucified him, otherwiſe, we read not of their repentance: *Acts* 8. (ſaith he) *though there is not mention made of the Samaritans repentance, who were apoſtatized from the Jewes, but laid claim to the Patriarchs*, Joh. 4. 20. *expected Chriſt*, verſe 25. *worſhipped God*, Ezra 4. 2. *yet that Philip ſhould know them to be ſo abominable in converſation, and yet baptize them, that is to be proved, ſince that others required repentance.* He may

adde

adde to theſe Elogies of the *Samaritanes*, *that they worſhipped they knew not what*, Joh 4.22. and that they bore that good will to the people of the *Jewes*, that when *they perceived Chriſt with his Diſciples to be for Hieruſalem* at the time of the Paſſeover, they would not let them have meat for money, *Luk.* 9. 51, 52. And I confeſſe, as much of repentance in them, as was required in any to the acceptation of Baptiſme, namely, a renuntiation of their falſe way, and a profeſſed acceptation of the tender of the Goſpel. There yet followes, *If this be not a giving of holy things to dogs*, (*which* Tertullian *and* Auſtin *give warning of even in baptizing*) *I know not what is*; *Let a man be a notorious Ranter, Sodomite, Scoffer at godlineſſe, drunkard, no matter what*; *this is known and proved, yet a Chriſtian nomine tenus, therefore you muſt baptize him.* Where I pray do I ſpeak of baptizing any that is *nomine tenus* a Chriſtian? My opinion is, that ſuch that have the name Chriſtian, are baptized already, I hope ſuch contradictions ſeldom come from my pen. That theſe are no words of mine, my adverſary will acknowledge, and that any ſuch conſequence can be gathered from any thing that I have ſaid, that I muſt baptize perſons of this quality already baptized, the Reader can ſcarce imagine; this I impute to haſte or paſſion preventing or obſtructing the uſe of reaſon. He muſt then blot out *Chriſtian nomine tenus*, and inſert inſtead of it, *an Heathen, Jew or Pagan* (otherwiſe he is already a baptized perſon, and in incapacity for baptiſme) by the power of the Word preached, brought to renounce his way of Paganiſme, Judaiſme: and to profeſſe and engage to a Chriſtian faith and converſation. Theſe are the men that I would have baptized, and if we muſt account them to be *dogs, and ſwine*, all Scripture-baptizers are within the laſh, they have given baptiſme to them. That *repentance as well as faith was required in baptiſme, appeares* (ſaith he) *by the ages following the Apoſtles, yea, and in the Apoſtles time likewiſe.* A profeſſion of both was indeed required, they that renounced heathen worſhip, renounced heathen converſation with it; They engaged to a Chriſtian faith, and they engaged to a Chriſtian converſation. Mr. *F.* addes, *For thoſe who would live in their luſts; they deferred their baptiſme, knowing what that required.* I have read of the deferring of baptiſme in thoſe times, and the reaſons aſſigned, why they put it off: But I have not met with this reaſon. Mr. *Marſhall* in his defence of Infant-Baptiſme

hath

hath given many reasons, why some put off baptisme. Some to be baptized at the age that Christ was baptized; Some to be baptized in the river where he was baptized; Some to be baptized by some special Bishop of eminent place; Some, (which it seems was most common) because they conceived, that it takes away all sin, and therefore they would have it delayed, till sin was well over, for which he quotes many authorities: *Tertullian* (it appears) would have it delayed upon this ground, seeing he would not have unmarried persons baptized, but to stay till lust were extinguished; and disswading from baptisme in younger years, he hath these words, *Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?* de baptis. cap. 18. Yet perhaps some might delay it upon the account that he mentions, though he quotes no authority for it, but that *Tertullian and Nazianzen* intimate it, one of whom was for delaying of baptisme in the place quoted, the other against it, as I find him cited. But in case any did delay it upon the grounds by him mentioned, might it not be their fault that did administer it? in keeping the door too narrow, as well as their sin who put off the time of it, seeing Mr. *F.* himself complains of the rigour of some in *New-England*, in holding men off from entrance into Church-fellowship, by that door which is set up in the room and place of baptisme.

Mr. *Firmin*, as well in his Serious question stated, as in his Appendix against me, vouches many authorities, first *Presbyterians*, instancing in his margine *Lond. Min. Jus Div* pag. 115. But in my book that page hath no such thing; *Gillespies Aarons Rod* quoting many pages, I can recompence him in setting up some of the Congregational way against him. Mr. *Gillesp.* will not have a known unregenerate man baptized; But Mr. *Cobbet* saith, *John did and might lawfully baptize those multitudes, albeit in the general he knew that many, yea, most of them would prove false and frothy*; And makes *visibility of interest in the Covenant the Churches guide in application of Baptisme*, pag. 52. And how large a visibility of interest is, is cleer, and I have already shewen, Let his words before quoted be considered; and to these adde that which he hath, pag. 54, 55. *The initiatory seal is not primarily and properly the seal of mans faith, or repentance, or obedience, but of Gods Covenant rather: The seal is to the Covenant, even Abrahams Circumcision was not primarily a seal to his faith of righteousnesse; but to the righteousnesse of faith exhibited and offered in the Covenant;*

Covenant; yea, *to the Covenant it ſelf, or promiſe, which he had believed unto righteouſneſſe: hence the Covenant of grace is called the righteouſneſſe of faith*, Rom. 10. *Hence*, Acts 2. 38, 39. *the ſeal of baptiſme is put to the promiſe, as the choyce matter and foundation in view, and as that was a ground of repentance it ſelf, Repent and be baptized, for the promiſe is to you: Not, for you have repented, as if that were the thing to be firſtly ſealed by baptiſme*, but the promiſe rather.

Appendix, pag. 57. Mr. *Firmin* quotes in the Lump *the Fathers, Councels, School-men, out of Gregory de Val.* as if all were of that mind. In his Serious queſtion he quotes, *Auſtin, Alexander Hales, Aquinas, Gregory de Valen.* In his appendix, *Juſtin Martyr, Concil. Neoceſar. Concil. Nic. Concil. Elib.* as ſtrict in admiſſion of their *Catechumeni*, concerning which I might have much to ſay.

Firſt, How would he like it in other things, to leave the clear rode and track of Scriptures, to hunt after humane authorities? If we can but ſay, *From the beginning it was not ſo*, In caſe the authorities were more in number, more eminent in honour, we have ſufficient. The Scripture-way taking in thoſe that the Word had brought to a profeſſion of Chriſtianity upon engagement to it, is as clear as though it were written with a ray of the Sun.

Secondly, For Fathers and Schoolmen, their opinion about Baptiſme, on which they ground the neceſſity of prærequiſites to it, is known; and as he may quote them againſt me, ſo I can quote them againſt him, and thoſe of his party. They maintain (and as unanimouſly as they do the thing in debate) that Sacraments confer grace on the receiver, in caſe he put no obſtacle, on which account they expect not grace in the perſon for baptiſme, (which they believe not to be poſſible, ſeeing the Sacrament is to work it) but a convenient diſpoſition to grace, which they call *merit ex congruo*. Let *Suarez* ſpeak in the name of the reſt, having laid down this Propoſition, [d] *That Baptiſme may be worthily adminiſtred; beſides a willingneſſe to receive the Sacrament, a diſpoſition ſuitable to the holineſſe of the Sacrament is required.* And then anſwering the queſtion, *What this diſpoſition* is, he anſwers, [e] *That is neceſſary and ſufficient, which is neceſſary and ſufficient*

[d] Ut alicui digne detur baptiſmus, præter voluntatem ſuſcipiendi Sacramentum neceſſaria eſt diſpoſitio conveniens ſanctitati Sacramenti. [e] Reſp. Eam ſufficere & neceſſariam eſſe quæ ad conſequendum effectum Baptiſmi fuerit ſufficiens ac neceſſaria: quia cum per baptiſmum detur gratia, ſi aliquis eſt recte diſpoſitus ad effectum baptiſmi conſequendum in inſtanti, quo receperit baptiſmum perfectum, recipiet gratiam: Ergo cum ſufficienti dignitate & ſanctitate recipit Sacramentum: Quia cum hoc ſit Sacramentum mortuorum non eſt ad illud digne ſuſcipiendum præ exigenda gratia ad quam conferendam ipſum eſt conſtitutum: Ergo ſufficiet illa diſpoſitio, cum qua Sacramentum conferet talem effectum.

ficient

ficient to attain the effect of the Sacrament, and gives his reaſon, *ſeeing by baptiſme grace is given; If any one be rightly diſpoſed to receive the effect of baptiſme, in the inſtant that he receives perfect Baptiſme, he ſhall receive grace; therefore he receives the Sacrament with ſufficient dignity and ſanctity*; further adding, *Seeing this is a Sacrament of the dead, grace is not prærequired for the receiving of it, being ordained to confer grace, that diſpoſition is ſufficient upon which the Sacrament confers ſuch an effect*, Suarez in tertiam partem Thom. Tom. 3. Q. 68. Diſ. 24. art. 4. Sec. 2. p. 250. Our opinion being otherwiſe of the work of baptiſme, it is otherwiſe concerning admiſſion to baptiſme, when men are willing to be received into the number of Chriſtians, and will engage for Chriſtian wayes, (which neceſſarily implies a profeſſion of repentance of all unchriſtian practices) we judge them to have right of admiſſion.

Thirdly, How far rules laid down by ſome Fathers, and Councils for the way of diſcipline did exceed in rigour, hath been the complaint of many; not admitting thoſe that had been overtaken by temptation, to Church-fellowſhip: notwithſtanding any evidence of repentance, till after many years ſpace of humiliation; In which time how much advantage might be given to Satan, let men of experience judge. Mr. *F.* himſelf diſlikes their long deferring of their *Catechumeni* from baptiſme, and may not others have liberty to manifeſt their diſlike as well as he?

Fourthly, Let it be taken into due conſideration, whether ſuch rigour in holding converts off ſo long a ſpace; and requiring ſuch an height in preparatory graces, were not a great *remora* to the progreſſe of the Goſpel? and gaining in men to Chriſtian profeſſion? How ſpeedy a progreſſe the Goſpel made in the Apoſtles times we may ſee in the Acts of the Apoſtles, and Eccleſiaſtical Story. Dr. *Andrewes* in his Preface to his Work on the Commandements, quotes a teſtimony of *Egeſippus*, That *by the diligent inſtructing of the Church, there was no known Common-Wealth of any part of the world inhabited, but within 40 years after Chriſts Paſſion received a great ſhaking off of heatheniſh Religion.* But how ſlowly it proceeded after ſome time, is overplain: May not the difference of their way, that thus ſwerved from the Apoſtles, and men in Apoſtolique times, be aſſigned as a great reaſon? We find them facile in admiſſion, but in the

mean

mean time exceeding plain in making known what was required of them in order to the end of their profeſſed faith, their everlaſting ſalvation that were admitted.

Fifthly, If it may be granted, (which according to Scripture rules can never be denied) that men wrought off from Turciſme, Paganiſme, Judaiſme, and brought to a profeſſion of Chriſtianity, and a profeſſed engagement to Chriſtian wayes, have their right, and ſtand in title to baptiſme; If then upon obſervation of inconveniences ariſing, (as jealouſies conceived that they may offer themſelves out of deſign to work themſelves into a fairer opportunity of perſecution, as was ſuſpected in *Paul*) the Church in Prudence, for ſome ſpace ſhall delay their admiſſion, I ſhall not contend; Onely I aſſert their right, and juſtifie their practice, that proceed accordingly, and unleſſe ſome great cauſe appear to the Churches prejudice, tendring themſelves they are actually to be received.

A Digreſſion for Vindication of Chap. 32. *of the* Treatiſe of the Covenant, *from Mr.* Baxters *Exceptions touching the Faith that entitles to Baptiſme.*

The occaſion of this Digreſſion.

HEre I am put upon it to take into conſideration, that which Learned Mr. *Baxter* in his Apology hath been pleaſed to oppoſe againſt me. Though he be large, I ſhall make it my buſineſſe (if it may be) to be more brief. I entitled the two and thirtieth Chapter of my Treatiſe of the Covenant, in this manner, *A dogmatical Faith entitles to Baptiſme*: being a Corollary, naturally (as I yet think) inferred from the Doctrine, that I had before delivered, of the latitude of the Covenant; explaining my ſelf, that I meant ſuch a *faith, that aſſents to Goſpel-truths, though not affecting the heart, to a full choyce of Chriſt*, and therefore ſhort of that Faith which is juſtifying, and ſaving; ratifying it with ſeveral arguments. In which I might well have thought, that I ſhould have found my ancient friend, my Second, rather then an Adverſary, conſidering what he had delivered, pag. 224. of his Treatiſe of Infants Church-Membership. *This*

Mr. Baxters *conceſſion.*

opinion, that the Covenant of grace which Baptiſme ſealeth, is onely to the Elect, and is not conditional, is one of the two maſter pillars in the Antinomian fabrick: and afterwards, *If any ſhall think that this affirming* [*that Chriſt hath brought the reprobate alſo into a Covenant of grace conditional*] *be any part of the Arminian errors, as the whole ſcope of Scriptures is againſt them, ſo Mr.* Blake *hath ſaid enough to ſatisfy: He that will deny reprobates to be ſo farre within the Covenant of grace, muſt not onely denye infant Baptiſme, but all Sacraments, till he be able infallibly to diſcern a man to be Elect.* I did never riſe ſo high in words for my opinion as the Reader may here ſee my adverſary hath done for me, and I ſhall have more occaſion to obſerve his conceſſions in this thing. But how to reconcile all, with that which, pag 327. of the ſame Treatiſe he delivers, I know not. *If men be taught once that it is a Faith ſhort of juſtifying, and ſaving faith, which admitteth men to Baptiſme, as having true right in foro Dei, it will make foul work in the Church.* This he aſſerts with five ſeveral arguments, to which in the Chapter quoted I gave a brief anſwer, not once naming the Author, that (if it might be) ſuch conteſts with a man that I ſo much honour, might not have been obſerved, and yet the truth not deſerted. Before he enters upon any refutation of my arguments, or vindication of his own, he is pleaſed to ſpend nine full pages, to ſhew how farre he takes unregenerate men to be in Covenant, and to diſcover (as he ſaies) my mind in this point. Neere to the cloſe of that diſcourſe, he ſaies, that *what I mean by Covenanting, he deſpairs to know*; which ſurely will be the Readers wonder, that knowes what he hath ſaid, pag. 224. before mentioned, *I ſpeak impartially, according to my judgement, I think there is more true worth in thoſe two or three leaves of Mr.* Blakes *book in opening of the Covenant, then in all, &c.* And as he deſpaires to know my meaning, ſo I as much deſpair ever to make it known to him. He quotes very many expreſſions of mine, and knowes my meaning in none of them, and ſome that I borrow from others, as Dr. *Preſton* and *Pareus*, and he knowes neither my meaning nor theirs in them. And in caſe I ſhould make attempt, if it might be, to make it further clear, he hath ſtill an art, to render it obſcure. He obſerves, that I ſay, (that which I think all ſay) that *the accepting of the word* [*preacht is the note of the Church*] and gives his cenſure that *that is a more laxe, and ambiguous terme, then the former.* And

ſeeing

ſeeing that I am not able to ſatisfie him with any notions that I can reach, I ſhall endeavour at preſent to help his ſight, in pointing out to him, men in Covenant with God; that when he lookes upon the men, and the character given of God himſelf, of them, he may (if he pleaſe) gueſſe at the Covenant it ſelf. Do's Mr. *Baxter* know what Covenant that was, that the Captains of tribes, Elders, Officers, with all the men of *Iſrael*, little ones, wives, ſtrangers, from the hewer of wood to the drawer of water entred into? *Deut.* 29. and what kind of men they were that avouched the Lord to be their God, and whom God avouched to be his peculiar people? *Deut.* 26. 17, 18. Do's he know who thoſe be, that throughout the Old Teſtament-Scriptures, the Lord calls his people, his inheritance, his portion, his ſonnes and daughters? And who thoſe kinſmen of *Paul* according to the fleſh were, to whom pertained the *Adoption*, the *glory*, and the *Covenants*? Rom. 9. 4. Do's he know who thoſe were in New Teſtament-times, that were converted by thouſands, myriads of thouſands? then he knows who God lookes upon, as his in Covenant, and to whom Covenant priviledges appertain. And doubtleſſe thoſe hearers that *Iſaiah* deſcribes (and from him all the Evangeliſts) *of fat hearts, dimme eyes, heavy eares*, whileſt God had not removed his Candleſtick, were included: They were in Covenrnt with God. If it be ſaid that theſe are ſaid to be in Covenant equivocally; I anſwer, 1. I dare not charge the conſtant language of the Spirit of God in Scripture with equivocation. 2. I am ſure that they upon that account, really enjoyed the priviledges under diſpute, were called by the name of a Church, *Acts* 7. 38. and had that elogy, a *people near unto the Lord*. And to ſay that theſe were in Covenant with a *quatenus*, *aliquo modo ſic, aliquo modo non*, when God teſtifies that they avouch him to be their God, I think is too great boldneſſe. That thoſe that roſe no higher, then theſe mentioned, have no right to the great bleſſings of the Covenant, as *Chriſt, pardon, Juſtification, Adoption, glory*, upon that account, that they come not up to the faith called for in Covenant, I freely with Mr. *Baxter* grant; Thoſe are too high Favours for Covenant breakers, yet I ſay, as all *Iſrael* did *de facto* enjoy, ſo all of the like faith *in foro Dei* have their right of his free bounty to all thoſe Church-priviledges that ſerve to fit for glory. He is pleaſed to ſay, Mr. *Bl. had done better, if, with that moderate, reverend, godly man*

Scripture-characters of men in Covenant.

Mr. Stephen Marshall *he had distinguished between those two questions* [*who are Christians, or Church-members?*] *and* [*whom we are to judg such and use as such?*] *and to bring in the latter rank onely.* I know not where Mr. *Marshall* thus distinguishes. If he speaks of members of the Church invisible, it is not at all to our purpose, we are not speaking to them: And if he mean members of the Church visible, I know no use of such distinction, we can well enough know such members, otherwise they were not visible. Let Mr *Baxter* look upon those notes of a Church-member which he mentions, where he intended a confutation of my 31. chap. in case I had not spoken to his mind, and the same things with him, and then see whether such cannot be known? I think those of the *Worcestershire* combination, may know who those be whom they take into Communion. In a parenthesis he is pleased to tell me, that *herein I joyn with Mr.* Tombs. To which I reply, what animosity soever he hath against me, I shall not leave any one truth to shunne agreement with him, when Mr. *Baxter* himself affirms, *that Mr.* Tombs *and he are agreed in* that particular that he there mentions, pag. 92. *though most Divines,* (as he there saies) *are against them both;* sure I may boldly joyn with him, when most Divines are for us. He tells me, *Those that professe to fear God, and love him, we must love and honour as men, that do fear and love him: yet in different degrees, as the signs of their graces are more or lesse probable. In some common confessing Christians, we see but small probability: yet dare we not exclude them from the Church, nor the number of true believers, as long as there is any probability; Others that are more judicious, zealous, diligent and upright of life, we have far stronger probability of: and therefore love and honour them much more.* All this is true, in case we were to enquire after the fear of God in its power, or the image of God, renewed in sincerity; But when it is applyed to visible Church-membership, I know not what to make of it. Must I more or lesse honour a man, accordingly as he appears more or lesse visibly in Congregations? After a long discourse about the Covenant, and faith dogmatical, which I shall have occasion further to touch upon, he concludes thus, *The words which Mr.* Bl. *questioneth, I confesse are mine, against Dr.* Ward, *and I did not think in so grosse an opinion Dr.* Ward *would have found any second to undertake that cause.* How this passage fell from his penne, may well be to every intelligent Reader

The Author vindicated from singularity.

Reader matter of admiration: not that he chargeth an opinion from which he diſſents, to be ſo notably groſſe, (which is not very unuſual) but that a man of ſuch multiplicity of reading, ſhould think that Dr. *Ward* in this opinion would not have found a ſecond, when if he hath peruſed our approved Authors about the queſtion, eſpecially ſince it came to a punctuall juſt debate, he may ſoon ſee that he hath almoſt every one to appear for him if this which he mentions be his opinion, unleſſe perhaps he hath been ſo held in reading the Fathers, and other Writers for the firſt thirteen, or fourteen hundred years (in which few will, I think, come out and vye with him,) that he hath not regarded what hath been ſaid this hundred and fifty years, in this corner of the world, when his book came firſt out, I received a letter from as learned an hand, as any I have to converſe withall, noting this, as a ſingular tenent; and when upon occaſion I have mentioned it, that Mr. *Baxter* holds that *no faith that is ſhort of that which juſtifies, gives title to Baptiſme*, it ſounded ſo ſtrange that I could not gain credit to the report of it. He that hath ſpent ſo much pains in that Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. cannot be ignorant of that uſual diſtinction, of Covenant holineſſe, and holineſſe habituall, and perſonall. The former, (according to Divines and Mr. *Baxter* himſelf) is an holineſſe of relation to God, and ſeparation for him; which was found in all the Nation of the Jews, and now is in all profeſſed believers, and their ſeed. The latter is an inherent quality, infuſed by regeneration, by which the man is brought into conformity with the Law of God. The former (according to them, and him in that Treatiſe) gives title to Baptiſme, even where the latter is wanting. Thoſe words therefore were more then needed: [*If men be once taught, that it is a faith ſhort of that which is ſaving and juſtifying, which admitteth to Baptiſme*] ſeeing it is in reformed Churches generally, and univerſally taught, Mr. *T.* very well knowing, (as all do know) that in theſe laſt ages it is a doctrine generally received: and ſetting himſelf to oppoſe it, ſaith, that *he can derive its pedigree no higher than* Zwinglius: but he hath heard of thoſe that were *Zwinglius* his ſeniors, to be of the ſame mind, as the Reader may ſee in my anſwer to his letter. The Jeſuites generally charge it upon *Calvin*, and *Beza*, and thoſe of that party; and well they may, as their opinion, but not as their invention. As to that charge, they ſtand acquitted by their adverſaries: *Suarez* in

Thom.

Thom. part. 3. tom. 3. q. 69. art. 8. diſ. 27. Sect. 1. ſpeaking of this opinion, ſaith, *It is ancienter then* Calvin, *as appears by* Waldens. tom. de Sacram. tit. 3. cap. 53, 54. *yet Calvin* (ſaith he) *either encreaſed or revived it, as appears by* Ruardus, Lindanus, Prateolus *and others.* This eaſily may be yielded, and if *Chamier* may be heard, all Proteſtants embraced it. Mr. *Baxter* in the words before may ſee the opinion of that Divine, whom he ſo deſervedly magnifies, Mr. *Cobbet* full againſt him; notwithſtanding he lives where the greateſt ſtrength of that party is, that are his oppoſites. Let the Reader obſerve his fourth concluſion, pag. 52. *The Church in diſpenſing an enjoyned initiatory ſeal of the Covenant of grace, looketh unto viſibility of intereſt in the Covenant, to guide her in the application thereof; nor is it the ſaving intereſt of the perſons in view, that is her rule, by which ſhe is therein to proceed.* And compare with it the cloſe of his whole diſcourſe upon it in theſe words: *And I the more wonder, that any which confeſſe, that it's not to be denyed that God would have infants of believers in ſome ſenſe to be accounted his, to belong to his Church, and family, and not to the Devills, as true in facie Eccleſiæ viſibilis, &c. yet do oppoſe us in this particular now in queſtion.* If he pleaſe to peruſe *Pareus*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. as he ſhall find *Stapleton*, in objections there produced, his friend, ſo *Pareus* fully his adverſary. And I ſhall adde one teſtimony that carries many more in the belly of it, in which the Reader may ſee that Dr. *Ward* in this thing now in agitation, hath the generall vote of reformed Churches for him, and againſt Mr. *Baxter*. *Apollonius* ſpeaking to the queſtion, [b] *Whether infants whoſe immediate parents do not joyn themſelves by any ſolemn Eccleſiaſtical Covenant to any particular Church, are not to be baptized in the Church, but*

Quæſtio quarta, An infantes quorum parentes proximi ſolenni & Eccleſiaſtico fœdere alicui particulari Eccleſiæ ſeſe non adjungunt, in Eccleſia non ſint baptizandi, ſed ut baptiſmi incapaces & privilegiorum Eccleſiæ expertes ſint æſtimandi? *Reſp.* Exiſtimant Reformati, quod federalis quædam ſanctitas, qua jus habent illi qui hoc modo ſancti ſunt, ad media ſalutis & Sacramentum Baptiſmi, & qua ab Ethnicis, Turcis, ſimilibuſq; aliis infidelibus ſeparantur, 1 Cor. 7. 14. toti nationi ſeu populo communicetur, cui Deus tabulas ſui fœderis ita impertit ut eaſdem ſuſcipiant, & profiteantur, quos ad ſtatum viſibilis Eccleſiæ ſuæ vocat & ducit, Rom. 11. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. Hæc fœderalis ſanctitas transfertur ad poſteros non per proximorum parentum ſanctitatem inhærentem, qui ſua fide vel infidelitate eam poſteriis proximis vel tollerent vel ſtabilirent; ſed miſericordi Dei voluntate, qua fœderis illius privilegia externa parentibus etiam remotioribus promiſſa extendit & conſtanter impertit in multas generationes poſteris fidem profitentibus etiam iis quorum parentes proximi impii, & in fœdere Dei perfidi fuere.

ar-

are to be eſteemed incapable of Baptiſme and void of Church priviledges? anſwers the queſtion in theſe words: *The reformed hold that a certain fœderall holineſſe, (whereby thoſe that are in this manner holy, have right to the means of ſalvation, and whereby they are differenced from Heathens, Turkes and other like infidels,* 1 Cor. 7. 14.*) is communicated to the whole Nation or people to whom God do's ſo impart the tables of his Covenant, that they receive and profeſſe them, whom he calls and brings to the ſtate of his church viſible,* Rom. 11. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. *This fœderall holineſſe is tranſmitted to poſterity* (ſaith he) *not by the inherent holineſſe of immediate parents, which either their faith or unbelief ſhould take away, or eſtabliſh, to their immediate poſterity: but by the good and gracious will of God, whereby he extends and conſtantly beſtowes the outward priviledges promiſed to more remote parents, for many generations to poſterity, profeſſing the faith; even to thoſe whoſe immediate parents have been found wicked and falſe in their Covenant,* quoting theſe texts, *Pſ.* 106. 35, 36, 44, 45. *Iſa.* 63. 10, 11. 51. 1, 2, 3. *Ezek.* 20. 8. And confirming this aſſertion with ſeverall arguments, the laſt of which is this; [c] *Becauſe all of years in the New Teſtament were baptized by John Baptiſt and the Apoſtles, as Publicanes Souldiers, and whoſoever out of Judea, and the regions round about came to Baptiſme, wit hout any further tryal: provided that they profeſſed their faith and confeſſed their ſins, though there were many Hypocrites, generations of vipers and men of diſſolute courſes amongſt them: and therefore* (ſaith he) *their infants are alſo to be admitted unto Baptiſme,* adding that *learned* Walæus *largely defends this cauſe for the practice of reformed Churches in his Common places, pag.* 494, 495. adding yet further, [d] *We therefore reject the contrary opinion of thoſe which deny Baptiſme to the children of thoſe who live wickedly, and by their wicked life render the efficacy of their baptiſme to themſelves as null and vain. To thoſe we oppoſe* (ſaith he) *the judgement of the profeſſors of* Leyden *in*

[c] Quia adulti omnes in Novo Teſtamento à Johanne Baptiſta & Apoſtolis ſunt baptizati, telonarii, milites & quicunque ex Judea & circumjacentibus regionibus ad Baptiſmum devenerunt abſque longiore examine, ſi modò fidem profiterentur & peccata confiterentur; etſi hypocritæ, genimina viperarum & homines malæ frugis inter eos eſſent, proinde & infantes eorum ad baptiſmum admittendi. Cauſam hanc pro praxi Eccleſiarum Reformatarum multis diſputat Cl. Walæus, in locis communibus, operum in Folio, pag 494, 495.

[d] Rejicimus igitur Antitheſes eorum qui denegant Baptiſmum filiis eorum qui impie vivunt & vita ſua improba efficatiam baptiſmi ſui irritam erga ſe reddunt. Hiſce opponimus judicium Leydenſium in Synopſi Theol. ubi ſic diſſerunt, diſput. 44. theſ. 50.

in their Synopſis of Divinity, diſ. 44. theſ. 50. If the Reader pleaſe to conſult this quotation from theſe Authors, he ſhall ſee it very full to the purpoſe; as alſo *Walaus* in the place before mentioned. So that Mr. *Baxter* may ſee that he hath not onely me to oppoſe, together with the aſhes of Dr. *Ward*, (whoſe memory yet is to be had in reverence) but ancient Writers within theſe 1300. years, together with the concurrent voice of Divines in the generality of them in theſe 150 years laſt paſt, which in other Points he confeſſeth are his adverſaries, on whoſe ſide the truth is, whether on his few, or the Churches many, is further to be enquired.

A Vindication of ſeveral Arguments in the Treatiſe of the Covenant.

Chap. 32. of my Treatiſe of the Covenant, I bring ſeverall Arguments to evince this Propoſition, [that *A Faith which is ſhort of Juſtifying, and ſaving, admits to Baptiſme.*] The firſt of which refers to that, which I had before ſpoken at large, concerning the latitude of the Covenant, expreſſing my ſelf in this manner, [*All that hath been ſaid for the latitude of the Covenant, may fitly be applyed for the like latitude of Baptiſme*]. To this Mr. *Baxter* replies, *Therefore did I ſay the more of the Covenant before, to ſhew your confuſion and miſtake in that. It is not every Covenant, or Promiſe, that Baptiſme is the ſeal of.* I deſire no more of the judicious Reader, but to reflect upon that which I have ſpoke, Chap. 27, 28. of that Treatiſe, together with that which he hath been pleaſed to ſpeak ſo largely againſt me: His diſtinctions of Covenants, and Promiſes; The ſeverall wayes that (according to him) men may be in Covenant; How unregenerate men may be in Covenant, and how not; together with his multitude of Poſitions, (moſt of which look not at all towards the buſineſſe) and then conſider whether he, or I, ſtand more guilty of miſtake or confuſion, and whether he hath brought any thing home, after ſo tedious a diſcourſe, for ſatisfaction, or to give any colour to it, that unregenerate men are not ſo in Covenant as thereby to have intereſt in Baptiſme, which muſt be done, if he ſpeak any thing in oppoſition to me: My buſineſſe being to prove that they are ſo in Covenant, that they have upon Covenant-right, title to the ſeal; and if the Reader can find any thing tending that way, let Mr. *Baxter* conſider whether

Argument 1. vindicated.

Covenant and Seal commenſurate.

whether it be not in full oppoſition to himſelf, who reckoning up Mr. *Tombs* his errors, makes this the fifth in order: that he holdeth, That *the Covenant whereof Baptiſme is the Seal, is the abſolute Covenant of Grace made onely to the Elect.* Did not Mr. *Baxter* then believe that thoſe that are non-Elect were compriſed in it? The concluſion of his large diſcourſe is laid down by himſelf, pag. 63. in theſe words, *Though wicked men have many Promiſes from God, eſpecially the great conditional Promiſe of life, if they will repent, and believe, and though they are alſo by their imperfect equivocal covenanting with God; yet God remaineth ſtill unoblig'd to them.* But how this ſtands with that which he hath in diſpute in the place before mentioned, let him alſo take into further conſideration; where he chargeth this, as his adverſaries fourth error: *That every right adminiſtration of Baptiſme, is not Gods ſealing: Actually God ſealeth not, but when it is adminiſtred to a Believer. It may be called a right act of the adminiſtrator, according to Gods appointment, but not Gods ſealing.* Againſt which he thus diſputes, pag. 222. *If the Sacrament rightly adminiſtred to an hypocrite, have all that is eſſential to Gods actual ſealing, then it is his actual ſealing; But the Sacrament rightly adminiſtred to an hypocrite, hath all things eſſential to Gods actual ſealing; Ergo.* The *Minor* he proves at large, as I may have occaſion hereafter to make known. And whereas he ſo peremptorily determines, that though wicked men oblige themſelves, yet God ſtill remains diſobliged, let him conſider, whether God be not ſome way obliged to all that he avoucheth to be his people. If this be denyed, there will be found no great happineſſe to a people, to have the Lord for their God. But God avoucheth thoſe to be his people, *Deut.* 26. 17. who are yet in an unregenerate eſtate. And if we look into Scriptures, we ſhall ſee that this is Gods ordinary language. Are there many worſe to be found in any viſible Church-ſtate, then thoſe with whom God holds conteſt, *Pſal.* 50? Yet to theſe he ſayes, verſe 7. *Hear, O my people, and I will ſpeak; O Iſrael, and I will teſtifie againſt thee: I am God, even thy God:* Together with thoſe, *Iſa.* 1. to whom he addreſſes himſelf under theſe titles, *Rulers of Sodom, people of Gomorrah*: yet we ſee, verſe 2. what language he ſpeaks of them, *Iſrael doth not know, my people do not underſtand.* And whereas he ſtates the Queſtion as though the whole of the diſpute turned on this hinge; *Whether theſe men be in Covenant with God, as to Gods*

Mr. *Baxters* Conceſſions of the latitude of the Covenant.

God ſtands obliged to all that he doth avouch his people.

actual engagement to them; ſo far as that Gods promiſe is in force for conveying actual right to them, as to the promiſed bleſſings? and ſo whether it be a mutual Covenant, and both parties be actually obliged? And thus I ſay that wicked men are not in Covenant with God, that is, God is not in Covenant with them: Neither have they any right to the main bleſſings given by the Covenant, viz. *Chriſt, Pardon, Juſtification, Adoption, Glory.* I know no man that hath ſpoke ſo much as himſelf towards the proof of it in the affirmative: So long as they break not the Covenant-engagement, (in which he confeſſeth they have oblig'd themſelves,) God ſtands engaged to them for the greateſt ſpiritual bleſſings. But according to him, they break not Covenant untill they arrive at final impenitence and unbelief. He very well knowes that I hold that every wicked man in the Church lives in continuall breach of Covenant, and is therefore under the curſe and penalty of it; and that I ſhould think that God were actually engaged to give Chriſt, Pardon, Juſtification, Adoption, Glory, to them, in that ſtate and condition, were more then ſtrange. Theſe may know by vertue of their Covenant-priviledges upon what terms they may attain the mercies mentioned, and upon what terms God ſtands engaged to give them, and they enjoy the power of Ordinances to work them up to the ſaid terms, which they do not, who are without Covenant, and therefore are afar off, when men in Covenant are near. Did ever man ſpeak of an abſolute tye in a conditional Covenant, whether the conditions are kept or no? That therefore before mentioned which he calls the great queſtion between him and me; is no queſtion at all. It were madneſſe to affirm that, which with theſe limits he thus denyes. Yet ſtill I ſay, that the Covenant which Baptiſme ſeales, is made with the unregenerate as well as regenerate perſons; which as we have heard, he makes Mr. *Tombe's* error to deny. And becauſe the Covenant belongs to them, Baptiſme in like ſort belongs to them: and as upon that account we muſt baptize them, ſo *in foro Dei*, according to the mind of Jeſus Chriſt, they have right to Baptiſme: Which in caſe Mr. *Baxter* ſhall deny, I ſhall deſire him to reflect upon the afore-cited paſſages of his own; together with that which, pag. 65 of this Treatiſe he delivers. *If it be the whole matter of Chriſtianity that is profeſſed, but diſſembledly: then as he is equivocally, or analogically a believer, or Chriſtian, ſo I yield he is a member of the Church viſible.* And

Church-

Church-membership is one of his own mediums to prove a right to Church-entrance by Baptiſme, and here is a Faith not above dogmatical; At leaſt, ſhort of that which is juſtifying, and yet ſuch a faith as is real, having reall fruits and effects, and ſometimes reall miracles. If the argument hold when it is thus enfeebled, how much more when it is put in its full ſtrength? Such an one is univocally in Covenant, whoſe diſſimulation is no other then neceſſarily attends an unregenerate eſtate: in caſe there be any thing in Scripture above equivocation, *They remembred that God is their Rock, the high God their Redeemer*, Pſal. 78. 34. And whereas I ſtand charg'd in this diſcourſe by Mr. *Baxter* with ſeveral uncouth, if not wild, opinions and aſſertions about the Covenant, and Mr. *Baxter* deſpairs (as we have heard) of underſtanding of my meaning, I ſhall here endeavour, as to vindicate, ſo to explain my ſelf in like manner, that the Reader (if not Mr. *Baxter*) may be brought to a right underſtanding; avoiding, as much as may be, both nicety, and multiplicity.

1. It is ſaid, that I ſuppoſe certain Promiſes to go before the great Law of Grace. *Thoſe that ſuppoſe ſuch* (ſaith he) *are of two ſorts*, 1. *The Arminians and Jeſuites.* 2. *Such as Mr.* Bl. *about Church-Ordinances.* And having ſpent many lines upon the Arminians to ſhew his diſſent, and aſſent, ſo that the Reader may well have forgotten both me and my charge, he ſaith, 2. *The ſecond part of promiſes before the great Covenant of Grace is feigned by Mr.* Bl. (*and if there be any other that go that way, as ſome do, and that with ſome difference amongſt themſelves*) *and that is a promiſe of Church-priviledges upon condition of a faith, not juſtifying, nor ſaving.* One that Mr. *Baxter* will not deny to be eminently learned, (and I think as well vers'd in his Writings, and mine, as any man alive; Far better, I believe, then he in mine, or I in his) upon obſervation of this paſſage, replyed as by addreſſe to him, *You rather feign this of Mr.* Bl. *then find it in him.* And I profeſſe I know no man whoſe brain ever either hatch'd, or vented ſuch a crotchet. Neither do I know how this miſtake was ever entertained, (for I believe it was a miſtake) unleſſe it be, that taking for granted that there is no Covenant of grace entred with any out of the ſtate of grace; and finding, that I aſſert, that Church-Ordinances appertain to unregenerate Chriſtians, and thoſe that are ſhort of faith that is juſtifying, he here fancies a promiſe of theſe made to a faith of this kind: Whereas that

The Author vindicated from a fiction impoſed.

which I ſay is, That every acceptation of a Goſpel-tender (which tenders a man a Chriſtian outwardly) actually veſts him in right to theſe Ordinances, as it did the Jew outwardly, *Rom.* 3. 1. And that theſe Ordinances are neceſſarily requiſite to bring men up to the fruition of thoſe happy priviledges of Pardon, Juſtification, Adoption, Glorification. So that I conceit no promiſe of theſe Ordinances made to ſuch a faith, but an actual inveſtiture of every ſuch believer in them. Neither do I know any promiſes preceding the Covenant of Grace. Such muſt be made to meer Heathens, or thoſe that are in a parallel eſtate, *aliens from the Common-wealth of Iſrael.* Unleſſe perhaps ſome ſuch promiſe to ſome ſuch, upon ſome particular account may be found. Yet if he can work me to be of his mind, that *Election, Regeneration,* and *the Covenant of Grace,* are commenſurate, ſo that no non-elect man is in Covenant, then ſhall I ſay that there are Promiſes made before the Covenant. The Apoſtle ſpeaking of the *Jews,* that for the generality of them, were neither elect nor regenerate, ſaith, *To them appertained the Covenants.* I may therefore charge it upon him, with better reaſon then he upon me: Thoſe ſtand veſted in promiſes, that, he ſayes, are out of Covenant. *The Promiſe is ſaid to belong to thoſe Jews,* Rom. 9. 4. *on whom yet the Word took no ſaving effect,* verſe 6. *Hence by oppoſition to the Gentiles they were thoſe that were not ſtrangers to the Church, but of it. They were not ſtrangers to the Covenant of Promiſe, but in the ſame,* Eph. 2. 11, 12. *Hence God, ſaith he, maketh his Covenant with them all,* Deut. 29. 10, 12, 13, 14, 15. *ſpeaking there of that ſolemn renewal of the Covenant of Grace, as* Deut. 30. 6, 10, 12, 13, 14. *compared with* Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8. *evinceth. So,* Ezek. 16. 8. *he made a Covenant with that Church and people, many whereof proved very baſe, as that Chapter ſheweth. Cobbet. juſt vindicat.* pag. 46. Where much more to this purpoſe from many Texts of Scripture may be ſeen.

The Authour further vindicated.

I am farther charged, that *my common phraſe is, That they* (namely unregenerate men) *are in the outward Covenant,* with this note upon it, *what that is I cannot tell.* Who would not now think but that here were a phraſe peculiarly mine: Upon which the ſame learned hand as before, expreſſeth himſelf in theſe words, *I do not ſee that that phraſe is common with Mr.* Bl. *He rather uſeth it as from others:* which any may evidently ſee, if they conſult pag. 189, 190. of my Treatiſe of the Covenant.

But

But of this I have ſpoke before, and therefore his gueſſes upon it, that he believes that it is called outward, by reaſon of outward bleſſings annexed to it, might have been ſpared. They that uſe it, expreſſe their own meaning, *The Covenant* (they ſay) *is but one and the ſame; but all are not in the Covenant after one and the ſame manner: Some are onely in it by outward profeſſion, to the preſent participation of outward priviledges; but ſome by cordial acceptance* to the enjoyment of ſaving benefits by means of theſe priviledges. He ſayes in the place quoted, *I ſhould have thought it but reaſonable for Mr.* Bl. 1. *To have told us what thoſe outward bleſſings are that this Covenant promiſeth.* But what need I to tell him, when, pag. 61. he hath told me, that it is a promiſe of Church-priviledges, and I now tell him that theſe ſtand actually poſſeſt of theſe priviledges, and have all the Promiſes, together with theſe priviledges that the Goſpel contains. And that theſe priviledges are appointed of God, to bring them in Gods way to the poſſeſſion of them. 2. Saith he, *That he would have it proved out of Scripture that God hath ſuch a Covenant diſtinct from the Covenant of grace, which promiſeth Juſtification and Salvation, and having other conditions on our part.* To this I know not what to ſay; but that when Mr. *Baxter* hath proved that there are not onely mountains of earth in his Weſt ſide of *England*, viz. *Wreakin*, *Mawbourn*, *Clee*, but alſo mountnins of Gold, I will endeavour the proof of this, if I can tell how: for he hath had as many thoughts of ſuch golden *Chimæra's*, as I have had of any ſuch Covenant, diſtinct from the Covenant of Grace, which in my name he here imagineth. Having vindicated my ſelf from theſe impoſed fancies that never entred into my thoughts, I ſhall now endeavour, if it may be, further to clear my own meaning in theſe following Propoſitions.

Propoſitions tending to cleer the Authors meaning.

Propoſ. 1.

1. *Thoſe that take upon themſelves a Chriſtian profeſſion, being ſeparate for God, calling him by the name of Lord, that have Ordinances of God as their inheritance, that acknowledge a Deity, and no other but the true Deity; a neceſſity of worſhip, and none but the Chriſtian worſhip, theſe with me are in Covenant with God*, as was the whole ſtate of the Church of the *Jewes*, and the whole face of the viſible Church of the *Gentiles*, that were engraffed in their ſtead. This to me is plain in that they are the *Church* or *Churches* of God, *Acts* 7. 8. *Gal.* 1. 2. *The called of God*, Mat. 22. 14. *The people of God*, Iſ. 1. 2. Pſal. 90. 7. *They that ſacrific'd*

to

to the true God, Pſal. 50. 7. Are the *ſons of God*, Gen. 6. 1. Deut. 14. 1. Rom. 9. 4. Are a people *nigh unto the Lord*, Deut. 4. 7. Pſal. 148. *ult.* God profeſſing himſelf to be their God, *Pſal.* 90. 7. Are *Children of the Covenant*, Acts 3. 35. *Saints*, Pſal. 90. 5. Act. 26. 10. 1 Cor. 14. 33. *Believers*, Act. 8. 12, 13. Act. 21. 20. Luke 8. 13. *Diſciples*, Matth. 10. 1, 4. Acts 9. 1. & 15. 10. *Chriſtians*, Act. 11. 26. That all of theſe imply a Covenant-ſtate; and that unregenerate men have in Scripture all this honour, is clear. Theſe therefore with me are in Covenant. I know that as to all of theſe elogies it is anſwered in a word, that they are *equivocal*. An anſwer that I can ſcarce take into my thoughts without horrour; As though Gods oracles were all over, from one end of the Bible to the other, like thoſe of *Apollo*, and there were no reality either in their ſeparation for God, or gifts that they receive from God, (which as to illumination, conviction, faith, as well ordinary as extraordinary oftentimes are many) or priviledges that they enjoy: But this we ſhall have further occaſion to conſider; and when there can be no plain denial that all of this here mentioned argues Covenant-ſtate, a quarrel ſeems to be pickt, rather then any direct anſwer given. For as I ſay, pag. 189 of my Treatiſe, That in Old-Teſtament-times the Covenant was made with *Iſrael* in the uttermoſt latitude of it, with all thoſe that bore the name of *Iſrael*, making proof at large from *Deut.* 29. as the Reader may ſee. Mr. *Baxter* quoting the place, takes notice of no more then that it was made with all *Iſrael*: and infers, pag. 65. *So that it ſeems he takes all to be in Covenant that bear the name, Chriſtian.* And then queſtions; *What? Though they know not what Chriſt or Chriſtianity is? Is taking a name, entring into Covenant? The poor* Indians *that by thouſands are forced by the* Spaniard *to be baptized are ſaid to know ſo little what they do, that ſome of them forget the name of* [*a Chriſtian*] *which they aſſumed.* And do's not he think that a man may take as plauſible exceptions againſt his word, where he ſaith, *The rule is, That a ſerious profeſſour of the faith is to be taken for a true Believer*; If he would travel as far as *India* for it, as he doth here againſt Gods Word? Do not we know, that force may make theſe poor *Indians* to appear ſerious in their profeſſion? And it is wonder that it ſhould be ſo ſtrange with him, that taking a name ſhould be entring Covenant, or at leaſt that it ſhould imply a Covenant-ſtate: Let him conſult, *Iſa.* 4. 1. and thoſe manifold

nifold Scripture-Texts, which expreſſe the relation of Gods Covenant-people to him, in theſe words, *A people called by his Name*; or *on whom the Name of God is called.* And diſtinction ſhould be put between children of the Covenant by deſcent from parents in Covenant, whether Jewes or Chriſtians, (who continue their Covenant relation, till they profeſſedly caſt it off, notwithſtanding their ignorance) and ſuch that of meer aliens are to be received, having no other title then their own preſent qualification. This ought to be voluntary, as well in renouncing their old falſe way, as embracing the preſent, as we ſee it was in thoſe converts through the *Acts* of the Apoſtles. And it is not to be without ſome competency of knowledge, diſcerning the evill of their former courſe, and the happineſſe attainable in the preſent. And I am eaſily induced to believe that more knowledg by the induſtry of teachers, is now required, then was in the primitive times, ſeeing there is not ſo much of God by miracle to perſwade, and, as it were, to overrule: So that it is not a naked taking of a name that is intended, but that which ſtill attends upon it: As a wife is called by her husbands name, and withall makes her abode in his houſe, ſo it is with a Covenant-people, and was with *Iſrael*: They bore the name of God, and they made abode in the Church of God, enjoying his Ordinannances as their inheritance. Mr. *Baxter* ſaies, *For the Word of God, God oft beſtowes it on infidels, and in England there are men that deride the truth of Scripture, and eſteem it a fiction, and yet for credit of men come ordinarily to the Congregation. Theſe have the Word given, and ſo have other unregenerate men, but not by Covenant that I know of.* That God doth beſtow his Word on infidells, to me is ſtrange: it is true that he often tenders it to them, but in caſe they remain infidells, they put it away from them, and beſtowing implies not onely a tender, but an acceptance. It is the great advantage of *Iſrael* above other Nations that to them was committed the oracles of God, when others had not that honour. And to ſpeak of Gods giving his Word by Covenant, is a moſt improper ſpeech, ſeeing it is the very Covenant droughts; as though we ſhould ſay, he gives his Word, by his Word. And theſe ſure are no open deriders that for the credit of men make ſuch a publique profeſſion: this would work reſtraint on the one hand, as it puts upon profeſſion on the other. And in caſe any ſuch thing be, though the Covenant is perfidiouſly broke, yet (as I conceive)

conceive) not totally caſt off, as long as any open profeſſion is continued. What ſhall we ſay of thoſe that take their ſons, and daughters to give them to *Moloch?* this can be no low crime, and an high departure from the true God, yet theſe bring forth children unto God: and they are his children, that they thus ſacrifice, *Ezek.* 16. 20, 21. So alſo, *Pſal.* 106. 35, &c. *Iſrael was mingled among the Heathen, and learned their works, and they ſerved their Idols, which were a ſnare to them; yea, they ſacrificed their ſons and daughters unto Devils, and ſhed innocent blood, even the blood of their ſons and daughters.* Yet this, as appears, caſts them not out of Covenant; God notwithſtanding remembred with them his Covenant, ver. 45. This was therefore doubtleſſe but a partial apoſtaſie; taking in the worſhip of Idols, they did not totally caſt off the worſhip of God: God was not totally caſt off in *Judah*, neither did caſt off *Judah*. *Ahaz* was of the worſt of Kings, and yet his poſterity was reckoned among the people of the Lord. Had the *Jews* then been as ſevere diſputants againſt a Covenant-ſtate as are riſen up now, the Church of God had wanted an *Hezekiah*, he had never lived, much leſſe wrought ſo happy a Reformation in the Church of God.

Propoſ. 2. 2. *Thoſe that are look'd upon by men, as in Covenant with God, and ſo ordinarily judged (as the people of Iſrael were) by the name that they bear, their abode in the Church, and profeſſion that they make, and ſo accordingly ſtyled, they are truly, and really in Covenant.* A man may know a man to appertain to ſuch or ſuch a perſon, becauſe he ſees him in his family, hears him call him *Maſter*, ſees him, ſometimes at leaſt, in his work, and knowes him to have the repute of his ſervant; Though to know him to be a faithful ſervant requires more diligence of enquiry, and a ſtricter ſcrutiny: So a man may be as eaſily known to appertain to Jeſus Chriſt; The ſame Characters make him known. For all that is required to being in Covenant is viſible, open, evident: but ſincerity of heart in covenanting is inviſible and ſecret. And therefore the Jew outwardly, *Rom.* 2. 28. is called by the *Vulgar*, *Vatablus*, *Tremelius*, *Arias Montanus*, and *Caſtalio*, *Judæus in manifeſto*; by *Calvin*, *Judæus in aperto*; by *Beza*, *Judæus in propatulo*: the Jew inwardly, *Judæus in abſcondito*, or, *occulto*: Their Church, or Covenant-ſtation giving them thoſe great advantages after mentioned, was open and manifeſt. Thoſe that ſay, *Lord, Lord*, as, *Matth.* 7. 21. are of thoſe that avouch

God

God to be their God, and God avoucheth them to be his people. And therefore when they come with their ſacrifices, though in their ſins, and God upon that account teſtifies againſt them; yet he ſayes, *I am God, even thy God.* It is confeſs'd by Mr. *Baxter*, that *we muſt judge thoſe that make profeſſion, to be in Covenant with God: we muſt give them the name of Chriſtians, and men in Covenant with God, and we muſt uſe them as Chriſtians in works of charity and Ordinances, and Church-communion, and ſo muſt uſe their Children as Chriſtians children.* And ſeeing reaſon to judge ſo, (according to Scripture-character of men in Covenant) they are ſo. Either in this we judge right, or elſe we proceed upon miſtake. If we judge aright, then all is well: If we miſtake, then all in theſe proceedings is null. Water hath been applyed to the child of ſuch an one, but no Sacrament diſpens'd; And according to a mans hopes, thoughts, or fears of his fathers regeneration, are his hopes, thoughts and fears of his own baptiſme, and conſequently of his intereſt in Church-communion; for this ſtands or falls according to his fathers intereſt or non-intereſt in the Covenant. When Mr. *Baxter* is urged with this, he uſes to refer to his Treatiſe of Infant-Baptiſme, where he layes us down a grand Rule or Maxime, and out of that extracts many others. His grand Rule is, *That a ſerious Profeſſor of the faith is to be taken for a true Believer*: and this being laid down, he proceeds on. If this Propoſition were a Scripture-Maxime, then it would have born a farther ſuperſtruction; but being neither found there, nor any proof made that it is any way deduced thence, mother and daughters may all juſtly be called into queſtion: and ſeeing he cannot but know, that very many as to the thing for which it is produc'd, (which is in order to admiſſion to Ordinances) will utterly deny it, he might have done well to have made ſome eſſay to have proved it. I do yield that charity is to hope the beſt, but that we ſhould put our charity to it, or our reaſon either, for probability or certainty, when we are no where ſo taught, and have a more ſure rule for our proceeding, I ſee no reaſon. I can ſcarce meet with a Miniſter that ſayes, (and I have put the queſtion to many of the moſt eminent that I know) that he baptizeth any Infant upon this ground of hope that the Parent is regenerate; but ſtill with earneſt vehemence profeſſes the contrary. I deſire the Reader to conſider Mr. *Cobbets* third and fourth Concluſions in his juſt Vindication,

pag. 46, 52. *There is a bare external being in the Covenant of Grace,* saith he, *of persons who possibly never shall be saved.* Concl. 3d. *The Church in dispensing an enjoyned initiatory seal of the Covenant of Grace looketh unto visibility of interest in the Covenant, to guide her in the application thereof:* Concl. 4th. Visibility of interest, and saving interest are there oppos'd. See also Mr. *Hudson,* pag. 249. *John Baptist did not in his conscience think they had all actually, really and compleatly repented and reformed themselves, whom he baptized, but he baptized them unto Repentance,* Matth. 3. 11. *and they by receiving the same bound themselves to endeavour the practice thereof. It were a sad case for Ministers, if they were bound to admit none, or administer the Lords Supper to none, but such as were truly godly; or that they judged in their conscience to be so, or were bound to eject all that they judged were not so.*

Propos. 3. 3. *Mans obligation of himself in Covenant unto God, upon the terms by him proposed, necessarily implies Gods obligation to man.* Where God makes tenders of the Gospel by his Ministers to any one out of Covenant, there he makes tender of the Covenant; and where a person or people professedly accept, that is, engage themselves, (as myriads of thousands did through the *Acts of the Apostles*) this person, this people, each man of them is in Covenant. As Scripture calls them by the name of *Saints, Disciples, Believers, Christians,* so we may call them *Covenanters.* They have all a sanctity of separation, which *Camero* sayes, is reall, and Mr. *Baxter* disputed from thence to a right in Baptisme, from that Text, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. There is in most of them, if not in all, some graces that are reall, either common or saving, and a Covenant doth not wait till the terms be kept, and the conditions made good, before it hath the being of a Covenant. And whether these be every way sincere, or any way dissembling, yet, as Mr. *Baxter* acknowledges, they really oblige themselves: And God howsoever dissembles not, but is bound by himself upon his own terms which they professedly accept to confer all that the Covenant holds forth. So that whersoever man is obliged, there a compleat Covenant is made up. For Gods tender goes before, and man is the last party, and compleats the Covenant.

Propos. 4. 4. *Sincerity, and integrity of heart; or full reality in a mans intentions*

intentions to stand to the whole of a Covenant, is not of the essence, and being of it. Both parties stand engaged upon their respective terms, though one part should have unsincere intentions. A wife is a wife, and the marriage is compleat, when both parties have publiquely express'd consent, though she hold a resolution to be stubborn, refractory, profuse, &c. A man consenting to serve, whether in bare words, or taking earnest, (as is most usual) or by hand and seal, (as in the case of apprentices) is a servant, although he intend with *Onesimus* to purloyn, or take his opportunity to be gone. Mr. *Baxter* thinks it makes for his advantage, to say that unregenerate men are unsincere in Covenant; but that is a concession, that utterly destroyes him. If they be unsincere, or, as the Psalmist speaks, not stedfast in Covenant, then they are in Covenant. *A Propositione secundi adjacentis ad propositionem primi adjacentis valet argumentum.* If it be true that *Catiline* is a seditious man, then it is true that he is a man: that *Peribomius* is a vicious man, then he is a man; that *Judas* is treacherous and perfidious in Covenant, then he is in Covenant: A mans conviction that he is an unjust steward, or an unfaithfull servant, doth not conclude him to be no servant, or no steward, but the contrary. And whereas, pag. 66. he saith, *The differences, Mr.* Bl. *must take notice of, between humane Covenants and ours with God; or else he will marre all. Men know not one anothers hearts, and therefore make not Lawes for hearts, nor impose conditions on hearts: and therefore if both parties do confesse consent, though dissembledly, they are both obliged, and the Covenant is mutual. But God offers to consent onely on condition that our hearts consent to his terms, and therefore if we professe consent, and do not consent, God consenteth not, nor is, as it were, obliged.* This were somewhat to purpose, in case he could make it appear that Scripture denyes all being of a Covenant, where the all-seeing eye of God sees not all integrity and sincerity. But Scripture-language, which is the safest for us to follow, being (as we have heard) far otherwise, there is nothing marr'd in non-observance of any such supposed difference: For which we shall presently hear again and again Mr. *Baxters* own confession.

5. *There is a reall and serious purpose in many unregenerate persons to serve the Lord, and to come up to as much as they think he in Covenant requires*, though with *Austin* they have a great mind to delay, and often to put off the thought of their more exact, and *Propos.* 5.

ſerious ſervice; and too ordinarily think that they keep Covenant, when they break it. Having not as yet any right knowledge, either of their own hearts, or Gods commands: And in this poſture in which they thus ſtand before they come up any higher, yea, though they never come higher, they reach unto graces in themſelves reall, true, and good, and alſo do the works which God commands; and this ſometimes is Mr. *Baxters* own thoughts. When his buſineſſe is to inform his Hearers, or Readers, and not to make oppoſition againſt others, then he can uſe the word [*reall*] and forbear the word [*equivocall*] as appears in his *Saints everlaſting reſt*, Part 3. Sect. 6. *There is a common grace which is not ſaving, yet reall, and ſo true, and good, and ſo true grace as well as ſpecial grace which is ſaving.* Which may be a fair anſwer to that which himſelf hath ſaid, pag. 68. of this Treatiſe; *Mr.* Bl. *in his explication of this Dogmaticall faith, addeth by way of excluſion* [*though not affecting the heart to a full choyce of Chriſt*] *where he ſeems to imply, though he expreſſe it not, that the faith that he meaneth doth affect the heart to a choyce of Chriſt which is not full. But if ſo, then,* 1. *It is much more then aſſent, or a meer Hiſtorical, Dogmatical Faith.* 2. *But is the choyce, which he intimateth, real as to the act, and ſuited to the object? That is, the reall choyce of ſuch a Chriſt as is offered, and on ſuch terms? If ſo, it is juſtifying faith: If not, either it is counterfeit, as to the act, or but nominal, as to the object, and is indeed no chooſing of Chriſt.* That which is reall and true, is neither counterfeit nor merely nominall, ſo far as they know either Chriſt or their own hearts, they undiſſembledly chooſe and take to him, as expecting to be happy in him, rather then any other object; though too often it is upon miſ-information: and when they come to a right underſtanding of the terms, they are in danger to quit the way in which they might enjoy him. He further ſayes, *Mr.* Bl. *thinks that there may be an undiſſembled profeſſion, which yet may not be of a ſaving faith*; and addes, *But then I conceive it is not an entire profeſſion of the whole eſſential object of Chriſtian faith*, viz. *of aſſent and conſent.* In which it doth but caſt duſt in his Readers eyes, in confounding the entireneſſe of the object, and the integrity of the ſubject. There may be an entire profeſſion of the whole eſſentiall object of faith, where the will is brought in to make no more full choyce, or conſent then hath been ſaid. There is added, *It will be an hard ſaying to*

many

many honeſt Chriſtians, to ſay, that a man not juſtified may believe every fundamental article, and withall truly profeſſe repentance of all his ſins, and to take God for his Soveraign to rule him, and his chief good to be enjoyed to his happineſſe, and to take Chriſt for his Lord, and onely Saviour, and his Word for his Law and Rule, and the Holy Ghoſt for his guide and ſanctifier, and the reſt which is eſſentiall to Chriſtianity. I think it will be nothing hard for any honeſt Chriſtian to ſay, that a man not juſtified may believe every fundamentall article, as to aſſent, and that he may be convinc'd of the neceſſity of ſuch repentance, and accordingly to make profeſſion of it, as *Johns* converts were baptiz'd into it. That ſuch an one may freely yield that God hath right of Soveraignty and rule, and that he is the chief good to be enjoyed for happineſſe, and that he ought to take Chriſt for his Lord, and Saviour, &c. and that this may be done truly, not onely as to reality of aſſent, but as to reality of purpoſe to make this choyce, ſo far as the man knowes his own heart, or the mind of God in this work: though there be not that integrity to yield up himſelf wholly, which yet by the power of Ordinances through the Spirit in Gods time may be done, and through grace perfected.

Laſtly, *God ſetting up a viſible Church upon earth in order to that which is inviſible, will have thoſe admitted that give aſſent to Scripture-doctrine, and accordingly make profeſſion*: And this of it ſelf *in foro Dei*, brings them into Covenant-right, and viſible Church-memberſhip. And therefore according to the mind of God, and, as *Apollonius* ſpeaks, *jure Dei* in this eſtate are to be received; Though they ſhall hit or miſſe of the mercy of the Covenant accordingly as by grace they come up to, or by ſin fall ſhort of the Propoſitions contained in it. *A Scholar* (ſaith Mr. *Hudſon*) *that is admitted into a School, is not admitted becauſe he is* doctus, *but*, ut ſit doctus; *and if he will ſubmit to the rules of the School, and apply himſelf to learn, it is enough for his admiſſion. The like may be ſaid of the Church viſible which is Chriſts School*; *Vindicat.* p. 248. To which Mr. *Baxter* himſelf, if I underſtand him, hath given his aſſent in his Treatiſe of *everlaſting reſt*, Part 4. Sect. 3. *The door of the viſible Church is incomparably wider then the door of heaven*; *and Chriſt is ſo tender, ſo bountiful and forward to convey his grace, and the Goſpel ſo free an offer, and invitation to all, that ſurely Chriſt will keep no man off*: *Propoſ. 6.*

if

if they will come quite over in spirit to Christ, they shall be welcome: if they will come but onely to a visible profession, he will not deny them admittance. This seems to speak the mind of Jesus Christ for their admittance, and that *in foro Dei*, as well as *in foro Ecclesiæ*, they stand in Covenant-relation, and have title to Church-membership. Thus Mr. *Baxter* and the Reader may see my thoughts in this thing: and though I doubt not, but that he will question much that I have said; yet now at last I hope both he and others may know my meaning.

Argument 2. vindicated.

Argument 2. vindicated.

My second Argument is, *All the absurdities following the restraint of the Covenant to the Elect, or men of a saving Faith: follow upon this restraint of interest in baptism.*] Mr. Baxter answers, *What absurdities follow such restraint of it to sound believers, as I have asserted, I should be willing to know; though with some labour I have searched for it. Bear with me therefore, whilest I examine what you referre me to. It is, pag. 109. where you charge those absurdities.* I wonder that all this labour for search should need, when as he saies, he hath a reference, and the Reader I think may see enough from Mr. *Baxters* own hand in the places already mentioned; one part of the first absurdity which I have pressed, Mr. *Baxter* is pleased to repeat; *This restriction of the Covenant (to shut out all the non-regenerate) makes an utter confusion betwixt the Covenant it self and the conditions of it: or (if the expression do not please) the Covenant it self, and the duties required in it: between our entrance into covenant, and our observation of it, or walking up in faithfulnesse to it. All know that a bargain for a Summe of money, and the payment of that Summe: the covenant with a servant for labour, and the labour according to this covenant, are different things. Faithfull men that make a bargain, keep it; enter covenant, and stand to it: But the making, and keeping; the entring, and observing, are not the same: and according to this opinion, Regeneration is our entrance into Covenant, and regeneration is our keeping of Covenant: before regeneration we make no Covenant, after regeneration we break no Covenant, there is no such thing as Covenant-breaking. All this makes an utter confusion in the Covenant.* After a charge big enough, he saies, *I cannot give my judgement of the intolerablenesse, and great danger of your mistake here manifested;*

The restriction of the Covenant to the regenerate, confounds the Covenant and conditions together.

feſted; without unmannerlineſſe, I will therefore ſay but this, It is in a very weighty point, near the foundation, wherein to erre cannot be ſafe. To which I onely ſay, I wiſh he had ſpoken fully out, that the intolerableneſſe and ſuppoſed great danger of my miſtake, might have been ſeen, and I earneſtly deſire all my friends, that in caſe I erre in this manner as I ſtand charged, that they would afford me their help to diſcover my error; but I truſt I ſhall make it good, that my error at the higheſt is but equivocal. He addes: *In my Aphoriſms, (pag. 265.) I gave my reaſons for the contrary;* we muſt therefore ſee firſt what is ſaid there, where he thus beſpeakes his Reader. *Here let me mind you, of one uſeful obſervation more. The Covenanting on our parts, is a principal part of the conditions of the Covenant, though this may ſeem ſtrange, that a covenanting and performing conditions, ſhould be almoſt all one:* And indeed, I think all intelligent Readers will judge it to be farre more ſtrange than true. though we are to hear of that which is more ſtrange preſently, we are told of reaſons in this page, but I find no piece of a reaſon in it, but onely, *I ſay*, inſtead of a reaſon; And I know not where any thing towards a proof of this poſition may be found, unleſſe it be in the Poets *Hyperbole, Dimidium facti, qui bene cœpit, habet; He that hath well begun, hath half done;* yet half is not almoſt all. He goes on. *It is a truth ſo farre beyond all doubt, that our own Covenanting is a principal part of the condition of the Covenant of grace, as that it is in other terms a great part of the ſubſtance of the Goſpel.* Here are myſterious words. Is our covenanting a part of the condition, or is the condition a part of the Covenant? The condition is here made the *integrum*, and our Covenanting one part of the condition. This is above my reaſon. And for the other part, I ſay, if our covenanting be a great part of the ſubſtance of the Goſpel, then the Jew outwardly did make a better progreſſe in Goſpelwaies then we are yet aware of, or the Apoſtle underſtood when he ſpake ſo much as we read, *Rom.* 2. concerning him, for he was in Covenant, otherwiſe he had been no Jew at all, but a Pagan or Heathen. Having told us, (I cannot gueſſe to what end) that *the ſame act is called our conditions, as the performers; and Gods conditions, as the impoſer, and promiſer: giving his bleſſings onely on theſe impoſed conditions,* he addes, *Moſt properly they are called the conditions of Gods Covenant, or promiſe, rather than of ours; for our own promiſe is the firſt part of them, and our performance of that promiſe,*

promiſe, but a ſecondary part: Is not here a convincing reaſon? Our own promiſe is the firſt part, our performance the ſecond part; *Ergo* they are more properly the conditions of Gods, Covenant then of ours. I deny not the thing, but wonder at the reaſon; but, ſpeed it as it will, I thence collect, that promiſes and performances are diſtinct things, and that is enough for me. Our promiſing to God, I am ſure, is our covenanting; this then differs from Covenant-keeping, or performance, and is not to be confounded with it. There followes, *For*, 2. *Gods Covenant is a free gift of Chriſt, and life to the World on condition of their acceptance: This our Divines againſt the Papiſts, and the doctrine of merit have fully proved.* That God doth freely give Chriſt to thoſe that accept him, I freely yield, and that our Divines have fully proved it againſt Papiſts, I confeſſe, and that it muſt be aſſerted againſt Antinomians; but what Divines have proved that Gods Covenant is his free gift of Chriſt, and life to the world on condition that they will accept, I know not: It is the firſt time (I think) that ever I heard it. This then is a full definition of a Covenant, which I yet think comes ſhort of it; and if it be a truth, it well ſerves my purpoſe; many a Covenant is made, and conditions never performed. After his expreſſion of himſelf about the modification of our acceptance of Chriſt by faith, he addes, *Our acceptance or conſent, is our Covenanting and our Faith. So that our Covenanting with Chriſt, and our Faith is the ſame thing: that is our accepting an offered Saviour on his terms, or a conſent that he be ours, and we his on his termes. And who knowes not that this Faith or Covenanting, or conſent is the condition by us to be performed, that we may have right to Chriſt, and life offered.* I do know the latter, and therefore upon that account, (as upon divers others) I deny the former. I know that juſtifying faith is the condition by us to be performed; and I as well know, that it is not our covenanting, but our making good our Covenant. That Faith by which the Romans ſtood in Covenant with God, was ſuch a faith that the whole viſible Church of the Gentiles had, and the Jewes both, *Rom.* 11. But this was not a juſtifying faith, but ſhort of it. To make juſtifying faith, and Covenanting *Synonyma* is an error, I am confident, of what ſize I leave to others to determine. If they were both one, Scripture would promiſcuouſly ſpeak of them; but we find that it ſtill diſtinguiſheth them, and gives us clearly to underſtand, that the

greateſt

greateſt part of Covenanters are ſhort of Faith that is ſaving and juſtifying. Ordinances in which the Covenant of grace is diſpenſed, and which ſpeak all thoſe that entertain them to be in Covenant, are granted of God to men ſhort of juſtifying faith, as their proper inheritance, *Rom.* 3. 1. *Deut.*33. 4. Titles implying a Covenant-ſtate, (as I have abundantly ſhewed) are given of God to them that are ſhort of this faith, viz. *Chriſtian, Diſciple, Saint, Believer, Called, Brethren*: God impoſes Covenant-conditions, makes promiſe of Covenant-bleſſings upon theſe impoſed conditions, to thoſe that are ſhort of Faith that juſtifieth; Theſe therefore are in Covenant. Though I hear neither of Scripture nor argument, nor any thing elſe but bare words in two or three Paradoxes for my conviction, yet by a ſimilitude I ſhall underſtand, that our own Covenant-act is the primary condition of Gods Covenant. In his Aphoriſmes he ſayes, *It may ſeem ſtrange*, but now a ſimilitude ſhall render it familiar, *If a King* (ſaith he) *will offer his Son in marriage to a condemned woman, and a beggar, on condition that ſhe will but have him, that is conſent, and ſo covenant and marry him; here her covenanting, conſenting, or marrying of him is the performance of the condition on her part, for obtaining her firſt right in him and his: but for the continuance of her right is further requiſite.* If we had had either Scripture or argument to have given us a firſt light, then a *Simile* might have ſerved for ſomewhat, and come in as a garniſh; but being ſerved in alone, it may ſpeak the Authors thoughts, but never ſettle any in the truth. And I ſhall leave it to the Reader to judge whether the edge of it may not eaſily be turned againſt himſelf, and whether when it is brought home, it will not prove deſtructive to his own opinion. I muſt therefore, tell the Reader, that our relation to Chriſt whileſt on earth, is more frequently expreſſed in Scriptures, by eſpouſals, then marriages: as we may ſee through the book of *Canticles*, and *Hoſ.* 2. 14. 2 *Cor.* 11. 2. and that there is ordinarily a relation of men to God, preceding faith that juſtifies. Now Mr. *Baxter* is not ſo ill read in the Civill Law, but that he knowes that there are *ſponſalia de futuro*, and *ſponſalia de præſenti*. Thoſe, God is pleaſed to take for his people, that are his onely in the firſt relation, and to honour them with priviledges to bring them on to the ſecond. Whereas he ſayes, *Our Covenant principally is to receive, nor is it onely* de futuro, *but* de præſenti. I may anſwer, firſt, If our

Covenant be to receive, then it doth precede this receiving; and, secondly, if he mean, that it is our duty to receive Christ in present, and not to delay the least moment of time, I shall readily yield; but in case he say, that present profession and engagement to receive gives a people no title to any Covenant-relation, before Christ be actually and savingly received, I may well ask what we are to say to the whole body of Old Testament-Scriptures? were not all *Israel* in Covenant? were they not all visibly the people of the Lord? are they not owned of God for such, when they were at the worst and lowest? How many thousands of Scripture-Texts may be brought to evince it? Had they called themselves so, and valued themselves as such, on this account to be a people nigh unto the Lord; and no people so nigh, it might have been said to be their own vapour; but when God gives them that testimony of honour, and hath never done with it, sure he would have us to believe it. There is a first right therefore, before that right in the similitude contended for; and that is no other but a right of Covenant: to be without God and without hope is the case of a meer heathen uncircumcised in the flesh, *Eph.* 2. 11. The state of visible relation is one step nearer, than aliens from the Common-wealth of *Israel* do enjoy; and yet too short of a state of salvation. Mr. *Baxter* concludes, *By this time I leave it to the Reader to judge who it is that introduceth confusion about the Covenant, and whether it be an error of the lower size*: And I am very well contented to sit down and hear his judgment: and if it be upon this determined against me, I shall say the authority of man is mightily prevalent. I have yet seen no title of Scripture, nothing of reason, onely that which I take to be Scripture-Paradoxes, are laid down as Maximes. There followes, *As for that you adde, that then there is no Covenant-breaking, I reply,* 1. *quoad essentiam, et possibilitatem, there is,* 2. *quoad existentiam, there is a breaking of mere verbal and erring half Covenants; but if you think, that sound Covenanting may be utterly broke, then you are against the certainty of perseverance.* I desire to know whither this *essence, possibility* and *existence* refers, whether to the Covenant, or to the breaking of Covenant. If it refer to the Covenant, as the words seem plainly to imply, then here is a new piece of learning, that the essence of a thing may be broke, and the existence stand firm. I have learnt that existencies may be destroyed, and essences remain,

Restraint of Covenant denies any breach of Covenant.

Real Covenants may be broke.

main, and inſtance is commonly given in Roſes in winter; But I have not untill now heard the contrary. But if theſe referre to breaking of Covenant, then the meaning is, there is a *poſſibility*, but there ſhall not be a *futureity*: But this is flatly to gain-ſay the Scriptures, that complain ſo frequently of actual breach of Covenant. Somewhat therefore is granted, and ſomewhat denyed. It is granted that there is a breaking of mere verbal, and erring, half-Covenants; but I am told, that if I think that ſound Covenanting may be utterly broke, then I am againſt the certainty of perſeverance. If by ſound Covenanting, truth of Covenant be meant, this may be broke, and no Saint apoſtatize, but if integrity of heart and ſuch ſoul-qualifications as might be deſired in Covenanters be underſtood, the truth of a Covenant ſtands, where this is wanting: otherwiſe none but upright, honeſt, ſincere men, can ever make bargains. It follows, *They broke their particular Covenants about reforming Idolatry, and ſuch particular ſins.* And theſe particular Covenants were branches of their grand Covenants, and ſo *habemus reum confitentem.* It is farther ſaid, *They broke their verbal, and equivocal Covenant, or promiſe to God, whereby they ſeemed to accept him on his own terms, but did not.* But it ſhould be remembred, that this Covenant they broke was a marriage-Covenant, as is frequently teſtified in Scriptures, as, *Jer.* 31. 32. where the Lord ſpeaking of the Covenant made with *Iſrael* when he brought them out of the Land of *Egypt*: *Which my Covenant they brake*, ſaith he, *although I was an husband unto them*: which is further clear, *Jer.* 3. 1, 14, 20. *Hoſ.* 2. 17. This then was a reall, and no equivocal Covenant, or elſe Mr. *Baxters* ſimilitude, on which he puts ſo much ſtreſſe, is ſpoyled. And I never knew, that verbal Covenants, where ſincerity of intention for faithful performance was wanting, were equivocal Covenants: much leſſe where a man did not fully underſtand himſelf in covenanting. All want of integrity is not equivocation: Men may promiſe and not perform, men may promiſe and never mean to perform, (which I think few unregenerate men directly do) and yet not equivocate. If a Gentleman ſhall promiſe a Tenant a Leaſe for life, provided that he will give him a dogge, he brings him one, and accordingly expects his Leaſe, the Landlord puts him off in telling him that he indented with him for a dog-ſtar, or a dog-fiſh, here is equivocation; but had he directly promiſed and broken faith, it had

been no equivocation, but falſification. I have heard of one of quality that often ſolicited one to ſerve him, after long importunity he got a promiſe from the man, that ſuch a day he would come and ſerve him, he kept his day, and came and ſerved a writ upon him: This was equivocation; but if he had not come at all, as the ſon in the Parable did not work in the Vineyard, when he had ſaid he would, that had been plain falſification. If thoſe were equivocal Covenants, and no reality of the being of a Covenant between God and them in them, then all the honour that followed upon them, and mercies enjoyed were equivocal likewiſe. Then whenſoever God calls *Iſrael his people*, we muſt underſtand him his equivocal people: when he calls them *his portion*, we muſt underſtand it his equivocal portion: when he ſayes, *Judah is his inheritance*, we muſt underſtand his equivocal inheritance: and Chriſts word, *Matth.* 8. 12. *The children of the Kingdom ſhall be caſt out*, muſt be interpreted, the children of the equivocal Kingdom: and, *Matth.* 22. 14. *Many are* equivocally *called*: and, *Rom.* 9. 4. the Apoſtle muſt be underſtood, *To whom pertaineth the* equivocal *adoption and* the equivocal *glory*. Theſe certainly broke Covenant, and yet we have no example of Saints apoſtaſie in them. When the Jeſuits forced Texts of Scripture to find (if it had been poſſible) one or two equivocal ſpeeches in our Saviours words, as *Joh.* 7. 8. *I go not yet up to this feaſt*, leaving out [*Yet*] that ſo there might be either an untruth, (for he did go up) or an equivocation: as alſo in thoſe words of his quoted from the Pſalmiſt, *Joh.* 10. 34. *I have ſaid ye are gods*: how would they have gloried, in caſe they had learned, that Scripture was almoſt all over equivocal? Give them this, and the day is theirs in the doctrine of equivocation.

Mr. *Baxter* addes, *Your ſecond abſurdity is, That then there are no hypocrites*, and replyes *rather, Then all unregenerate profeſſors are hypocrites. They pretend meerly to real proper covenanting, and they do covenant but verbally and equivocally*. But the great falſhood of this I have ſufficiently diſcovered, and therefore my Argument which he notably curtails ſtill ſtands firm. It were too tedious to trouble the Reader with all my words and his.

The third abſurdity which I preſſe, Mr. *Baxter* doth not vouchſafe to name, but onely refers to his anſwer to Mr. *T.* I ſhall therefore let it alone, not intending to interpoſe between them.

Arg.

Argument 3. *vindicated.*

My third Argument to prove, [That a faith ſhort of juſtifying may give title to baptiſme, is, To make the viſible ſeal of baptiſme which is the priviledge of the Church viſible to be of equall latitude with the ſeal of the Spirit which is peculiar to inviſible members, is a Paradox.] To which he anſwers, *But you take it for granted, that we do ſo; which is too eaſie diſputing:* and I may well take it for granted, ſeeing in the next words he yields it; where he ſayes, *We give the ſeal of Baptiſme to all, that ſeem ſound Believers, and their ſeed; and we ſay, the ſeal of the ſanctifying Spirit is onely theirs that are ſuch believers.* Their ſeeming faith works then onely by way of cheat; to procure that which is none of their right, and ſo both ſeales are of equall latitude, which yet is more plainly expreſt in his following words: *But if you ſpeak onely of Covenant-right to Baptiſme,* coram Deo, *by his gift of Covenant, then I make them of the ſame extent;* and I cannot tell what other Covenant-right to ſpeak of, but that in which God avoucheth a people to be his, and himſelf to be their God, and I dare not have a thought of any thing but reality in his words. For his diſtinction which he hints here, and plainly delivers elſewhere, *of right in foro Dei, and in foro Eccleſiæ, both to Covenant and Baptiſme,* I ſuppoſe conſiderate men will pauſe upon it, before they receive it, eſpecially in the ſenſe which he puts upon it: 1. They may preſſe him with his own rule, *Ubi lex non diſtinguit, nec nos diſtinguendum.* Such a right to viſible Ordinances before men never granted of God, I would learn. 2. They may demand whether it be the Will of God, that any upon the latter right *coram Eccleſia* ſhould be baptized by the Church. If it be, then they have right *coram Deo*: If it be not his will, then they have no right *coram Eccleſia.* I know no Court that God keeps reſpective to viſible Church-priviledges, but his Church. 3. They may tell him of the neceſſity that is put upon Miniſters to profane this Divine Ordinance, in putting this ſeal ordinarily and unavoidably to meer blank paper, which is a moſt contumelious abuſe of it. Of *many that are called, few are choſen*; and yet all that are viſibly called, are thus ſealed, when in Gods ſight all title is wanting. 4. They may tell him, that poor ſoules are thus miſerably cheated in bearing them

The ſeal of the Covenant, and the ſeal of the Spirit, not of equall latitude.

them in hand, that this great priviledge, and conſequently all further Church-priviledges are theirs, when the conveyance is more fraudulent that caſts it upon them. 5. They may yet tell him, that a door is here opened to Anabaptiſme, or multiplication of Baptiſme. A new door, of which either nothing or very little hath ever been ſpoken. When diſcovery ſhall be made, (as according to theſe principles it may be often made) that the title, when Baptiſme was adminiſtred was barely ſeeming; then all was null *ab initio* in ſuch proceedings: and as ſuch perſons alwayes were in the eye of God, ſo now in the eye of men, they are unbaptized perſons: And in caſe God ever vouchſafe the grace of converſion to this man, he is now by Divine appointment to ſeek baptiſme. In caſe *Simon Magus*, who after baptiſme did diſcover himſelf to be in the gall of bitterneſſe, by Gods grace ſhould ever attain repentance and forgiveneſſe, (which *Peter* did not judge to be deſperate) he muſt then upon converſion afreſh offer himſelf to Baptiſme. If *Titius* be admitted into poſſeſſions preſumed to be his true inheritance, and afterwards it be made to appear that it never appertained to him, but to *Sempronius*; when this appears all is to be judged invalid. And if *Titius* ever gain due right, he muſt again procure poſſeſſion, and is not to hold on his former crackt and ſeeming title. So that whenſoever a Miniſter converts a baptized man, he muſt look upon former proceedings as null, and upon his converſion baptize him. Neither let Anabaptiſts here triumph, as they may baptize whom we have baptized, when they ſee them converted, ſo we may baptize whom they have baptized, too many of both parties, manifeſting over-evident ſigns of their unconverſion. 6. They may tell you that, that Scripture-diſtinction of circumciſion in the fleſh, and circumciſion in the heart, is hereby overthrown; ſeeing circumciſion in the fleſh, where circumciſion in the heart is wanting, is uncircumciſion: which the Apoſtle grants reſpective to true happineſſe, *Rom.* 2. *ult.* but denyes reſpective to Church-priviledges, *Rom.* 3. 1. 7. They may tell him, that this principle ſtanding, all perſons dying unregenerate, dye unbaptized; yea, all that were baptized in infancy and after converted, remain ſtill unbaptized. 8. That it is much to be feared, if not certainly to be concluded, that the major part by far of *Worceſterſhire combination* conſiſts of unbaptized perſons, there being, I doubt, no good evidence of true converſion

converſion in the moſt conſiderable part of them; ſubſcription to the confeſſion there, and conſent to membership, being all that is required; and whether it be enough for a good ſatisfying evidence that a man or woman is in grace, that he or ſhe hath ſubſcribed, or put to their mark, let any judge. I am ſure it is voyc'd, that the moſt prophane (where the Miniſter carries any authority) are as forward for ſubſcription as any. If all marriages were null, where grace were not in truth in the parties, I fear that through the Chriſtian world there would be more adulterous, then marriage-copulations. And in caſe where there is no grace, there is no ſubject for Baptiſme, there are as many unbaptized perſons.

Argument 4. *vindicated.*

The great condition to which Baptiſme engages, is not a prerequiſite to the being of Baptiſme.

My fourth Argument is, [*The great condition to which baptiſme engages, is not a prerequiſite in Baptiſme. This is plain, no man is bound to make good his condition before engagement to conditions; no ſervant is tyed to do his work, before he hath received earneſt; no Souldier to fight, before he is liſted, or hath given in his name. But faith that is juſtifying, to accept Chriſt is the condition to which Baptiſme engageth.*] To this Mr. *Baxter* anſwers, *What is the concluſion? Therefore juſtifying faith is not a prerequiſite in baptiſme, or accerding to the Simile no man is bound to accept Chriſt to juſtification before he is baptized*: And then begins highly to Rhetoricate. *I confeſſe the reading of ſuch paſſages in Grave, Learned, Godly Divines, and that with ſuch confidence uttered, as undoubted truth, and that in zeal to ſave the Church from the errors of us that are contrary minded, doth very much convince me of humane frailty, and that the beſt of men do know but in part, and in a little part too.* If Mr. *Baxter* ſeek an inſtance of humane frailty, he hath made no miſchoice in caſting his eyes upon me, he cannot ſee ſo many in me as I know; but I am ſorry, that he muſt put his wit upon the device of one, or at leaſt take hold on the moſt handſome ſeeming opportunity, to cry up one, and ſo to give too much evidence (as one ſaid upon the firſt ſight of it) of his own weakneſſe. As to the concluſion, *that juſtifying faith is no prerequiſite in Baptiſme*, in the ſenſe that every Reader may ſee I have given of it, I ſhall maintain, and as Mr. *Br.* hath heard, I have the ſtrength of the reformed Churches for my confirmation in it; but for the other, which ſerves onely to blind the Reader, and

to

A position by the Author disavowed and detested.

to bring me under a charge, *that no man is bound to accept of Christ before he be justified.* I look upon it as an assertion, both senseless and graceless. I believe it never came into the heart of any that is either grave, or godly to utter it, and that there is scarce any so witless, or graceless as to beleeve it, and so Mr. *Brs.* volume of 31. Reasons, *five*, pag. 84,85,86. *Twenty six*, pag. 94,to107. are almost at one breath answered. Few of them tending to oppose any thing that I hold, but in the farre greatest part brought against his own conceit; and no assertion, or opinion of mine. I suppose I could easily furnish him with a large addition of reasons, to deny this fancy; Faith is commanded in the morall Law, as I have asserted Treat. of the Covenant, pag. 18. and I think no man believes that Baptisme doth first put a man under such obligation. Some Papists do charge upon us, that we maintain that Baptism delivers us from the morall Law, and therefore the Councel of *Trent* anathematizeth those that hold it, but never any I think were charged to say, that Baptisme is our first obligation to it. 2. An unbaptized man is bound to endeavour to avoid damnation, but he that believeth not shall be damned. 3. He is bound to endeavour to obtain Salvation; but we must believe with the heart, and confesse with the mouth to Salvation. 4. Baptisme presupposeth the Covenant; but the Covenant, as I have often said, engages to believing. 5. None can be exempted from believing, but they are withall exempted from repentance; but unbaptised persons are to repent, *Act.* 17. 30. 6. Faith in Christ hath been actually required of the unbaptized, *Act.* 16. 30. And therefore it is marvell that when Mr. *Br.* judgeth me to be overtaken in this folly, he would spend so much time with me or so many words upon me, transgressing the wise mans advice, *Prov.* 26. 4. *Answer not a fool according to his folly.* When he thought I had no more wit than to think that no man is bound to accept Christ for justification before he be baptized, I marvel that he would set his wit to mine. But what is it that I have said to induce him to think that I am in that opinion. I have said? *The great condition to which Baptisme engages, is not a prerequisite in Baptisme*; and can any man imagine that I meant any more than that it is not required to the being of Baptisme? Can any man think that I ever meant that it is not required of the person that is for Baptisme, till after he be baptized? and have I not in the next page cleared mine own meaning, where I say, that *there is*

Reasons evincing that a man unbaptized is bound to beleeve in Jesus Christ to justification.

no

no neceſſity that juſtifying faith go before, but a neceſſity that it muſt follow after Baptiſme: further explaining my ſelf, *It is true that in men of years juſtifying faith ſometimes goes before Baptiſme, as in Abraham it went before Circumciſion: but it is not of neceſſity required to intereſt us into a rite either of baptiſme or Circumciſion*; and doubtleſſe I never thought that either *Abraham* or any other was juſtified by that work that was never required at their hand. I ſay, juſtifying faith, or grace in the truth of it, is no prerequiſite in marriage; and I further ſay, that a Miniſter in times paſt might, and a Magiſtrate at this time may lawfully marry perſons void of juſtifying faith or grace, and yet he is no better than a graceleſſe man, that thinks that perſons unmarried are not tyed to faith and godlineſſe. Grace is no prerequiſite to buying and ſelling. A bargain of ſail ſtands firm, though there be no grace in them that make the bargain. Men without grace may go to *Kidderminſter* to buy hangings and curtains, and thoſe of that place may lawfully trade with them, and yet both parties are before hand bound to grace and godlineſſe. But though my aſſertion is clear enough, yet ſome may ſay, my ſimilitude darkens it. I ſay, *No ſervant is tyed to do his work, before he hath received his earneſt; no Souldier to fight, before he be liſted, or hath given in his name.* To this I ſay, If my expreſſions which I thought were clear, (well knowing my own meaning, yet) to others ſeemed dark, no candid man would draw them further then the propoſition which my argument was brought to confirm, which is, That a faith dogmaticall, or as I explain it, *a faith ſhort of juſtifying, entitles to Baptiſme.* In my ſimilitude I looked at the reſemblance that is between a Souldiers liſting, a ſervants entertainment into his Maſters ſervice, and a Chriſtians Baptiſme. And as a Souldier is not bound in order to liſting, firſt to fight: nor a ſervant in order to his entertainment, firſt to work: ſo a Chriſtian is not bound in order to Baptiſme, firſt to believe to juſtification. And thus I fully explained my ſelf in the next page but one. *That faith which is the condition of the promiſe, is not the condition in foro Dei of title to the ſeal, an acknowledgement of the neceſſity of ſuch faith with engagement to it is ſufficient for a title to the ſeales and the performance of the condition of like neceſſity to attain the thing ſealed; To promiſe ſervice and fidelity in warre is enough to get liſted, as to do ſervice is of neceſſity to be rewarded.* So that any Reader I think might clearly have ſeen,

The Authors meaning in ſome miſtaken expreſſions cleared.

and I hope now will more fully understand my meaning: Having taken notice of Mr. *Baxters* great mistake, and upon it his injurious charge, I think it most meet in this place to take notice of another (though under another head) that so, at once I may vindicate my self from things of this nature. I say, in my Treatise of the Covenant, chap. 16. pag. 111. *Sincerity is said to be the new rule, or the rule of the New Covenant.* To this Mr. *Baxter* is pleased to reply, *When I first read these words which you write in a different character, and father on me, I was ashamed of my nonsense, for they are no better: but it came not into my thoughts, once to suspect a forgery in your charge. Farre was I from imagining that so reverend, pious, and dear a friend, would tell the world in print, that I said that which never came into my thoughts, and confute that soberly and deliberately as mine that I never wrote.* After many other words added, *If when we are dead, men should read Mr. Bl. book that never read mine, and there see it written that I said [sincerity is the new rule, or the rule of the New Covenant] can any man blame them to believe it, and report of me as from him, and say, what shall I not believe such and such a man that reports it in expresse words?* Can any man now think but that I father this upon him; and that I report it to the world in print, in expresse words, that he hath said it? will it not be said on Mr. *Baxters* credit that I said it, and wrong'd him in it? But I desire the Reader to peruse the whole Chapter; and in case he find not Mr. *Baxters* name there at all, then he must needs conclude that this was spoken at least *improvidè et inconsultè*, and some testimony of humane frailty given in it. I recite indeed some passages of Mr. *Baxters* in that Chapter without his name, being unwilling indeed to make it known that he was in any such opinion, or that he had laid any such charge of intolerable ignorance upon learned Divines as there he does. But of this he hath heard enough already from other hands; How can he tell that I mean him in those passages, seeing I never named him, but that the words are his? And when these words now in question (produc'd at a good distance from the other) are none of his, who can say that I meant him? much lesse can they say, that I have expressely charged them upon him. If they be in any odde corner of his book (as he saies he knows not but that they may be), he then may be yet charged with them, and therefore injuriously complains of any injurious charge upon him. But to return to what we have in hand.

Though

Mr. *Baxter* not injured by the Author as he is injuriously charged.

Though in Mr. *Baxters* five firſt Reaſons, there is much very well worth animadverſion, yet ſeeing there is nothing, but that which hath either already been ſpoken to, or elſe that tends to the overthrow of that ſenſeleſſe ſottiſh tenent, (which I profeſſe to abhorre) I ſhall paſſe them by. For his additionall 26. Arguments which he ſets, (I know not for what reaſon) at a great diſtance from the reſt; the greateſt part of them are brought, and mightily fortified to beat down that which I think never any but himſelf ſet up. I think his miſconceit firſt hatch't it, and I am well content to ſtand by; and ſee him murder it; For ſo many of them as look at all in oppoſition to any thing that I hold, I ſhall take them into conſideration.

Arguments borrowed from humane authority examined.

His two firſt arguments drawn from Authority, the firſt of the Aſſembly of Divines, and others of a number of Fathers, are brought to prove that the profeſſion of a juſtifying faith is required to baptiſme; and what is that to me, who never denyed it; but in plain words have often affirmed it? It is ſufficiently implyed where I require a dogmatical faith to Baptiſme. A dogmatical faith aſſents to that of *Apollos*, *Jeſus is the Chriſt*, and when I ſay that this entitles, I cannot mean, concealed or denyed, but openly profeſſed. If I ſay that a man that hath ſix pence in his purſe may dine at ſuch an ordinary, I do not mean with ſix pence concealed, or denyed, but produced and payed. Have I not both the words [profeſſing] and [profeſſion] both in the margent and in the Index? ſeeing Mr. *Baxter* calls upon me to declare my ſelf further in this thing, I do believe and profeſſe to hold that, he that upon hearing the Goſpell preacht and the truth of it publiſhed and opened, ſhall profeſſedly abjure all other oppoſite waies whatſoever, and chooſe the Chriſtian way for ſalvation, promiſing to follow the rules of it, is to be baptized and his ſeed, and that upon a right not onely *coram Eccleſiâ*, but *coram Deo*; It being the mind of God that ſuch ſhould be admitted. The authority of reverend Mr. *Gataker* againſt Dr. *Ward* is onely worthy enquiring into, citing *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Bucer*, *Whitaker*, as Mr *Baxter* obſerves. But Mr. *Gataker* himſelf underſtands not (as he ſaies) what Dr. *Ward* means by the initial faith and repentance which in the judgement of the Apoſtles gave right to thoſe that deſired baptiſme, and upon that account I cannot directly tell what that is that Mr. *Gataker* oppoſeth. The authorities quoted by him, reach not the thing that we contend

tend about *Luther* saies, *He* (meaning *Philip*) *will not baptize him unlesse he beleeve*; I say the same: Neither *Simon Magus* nor any of the Samaritans men or women could have baptisme, before they believed. *Calvin* saies, *He had not baptized him without true faith*, which is doubtlesse to be understood of *fides quam*, not *quâ credimus*, as appears in his words before. *There is no doubt but Ananias had first faithfully instructed Paul in the principles of godlinesse.* A belief of such principles then *Calvin* meanes. *Bucer* speakes onely *of profession of faith, and requiring of men to believe.* Neither is there any thing in *Whitakers* testimony that comes up to our purpose. For Mr. *Marshalls* Sermon of unity that is added, I have it not, and there is nothing quoted out of it. Whereas it is said, that *an hundred might easily, and truly be cited to this purpose:* I say, if it be but to this purpose, it is not to our present purpose. If they be brought to prove that justifying faith is required of men before baptisme, they may well prove that: but as I have said, so I do say, I think never man denyed it. Dr. *Ward* I believe never opposed it. If they be brought to prove that no faith that is short of that which is justifying gives title to baptisme, and speak no more than those already quoted, they speak not home to the purpose. And in case there be any that have said, that Baptisme still presupposeth regeneration, and that we baptize infants or men of age onely upon this supposition as regenerate. As Mr. *Baxter*, Append. pag. 71. saies that, *Learned Divines have given Papists great advantage in mistaking the nature of justifying Faith, thinking that it consists in* [*a belief of the pardon of my own sins;*] So I may say, that those, whosoever they are, that have confounded Covenant-holinesse, with that of regeneration and inherent sanctification, have given as great advantage to others, yea, to the Papists themselves. And as the former doctrine ha's perplexed many a weak soul, being not able to make good their assurance, they conclude thereupon their want of Faith; so these as much perplex the consciences of those that administer this Ordinance, which I had rather expresse in Mr. *Baxters* words then mine own, Append. pag. 70,71. *No Minister can groundedly administer the Sacraments to any man, but to himself, because he can be certain of no mans justification, being not certain of the sincerity of their faith. And if he should adventure to administer upon probabilities or charitable conjectures, then should he be*

guilty of profaning the Ordinance, and every time he miſtaketh he ſhould ſet the ſeal of God to a lye: And who then durſt ever adminiſter a Sacrament, being never certain but that he ſhall thus abuſe it? adding further, *I confeſſe ingenuouſly to you, that it was the ignorance of this one point, which chiefly cauſed me to abſtain from adminiſtring the Lords Supper for ſo many years.* And I confeſſe as ingenuouſly, that in caſe he can work me to his opinion, I ſtand reſolved for preſent to baptize no Infant, as being unable to know the Parents faith to juſtification; and further with *Walæus* concluding that *the Parents faith doth not juſtifie the child*; but as *Calvin* reſolves, *lib.* 4. *inſtit.* cap. 16. Sect. 20. *they are baptized into future faith and repentance*, which *Walæus* alſo ſayes is the opinion of moſt others: Neither ſhall I baptize any man of years till I have as high aſſurance, if not more, of his juſtification, than Mr. *Baxter* ſeems to think any man can have of his own. If this muſt ſtand, then Pædobaptiſts and Anabaptiſts muſt all leave their Principles; and both men and women when they have learn'd to read that new name in the white ſtone, [that is] have concluded their aſſurance, muſt turn Sebaptiſts, and then let us look for as many counterfeits, as there were Jews in Chriſts time with broad Phylacteries. Thoſe that bottom Baptiſme on the Covenant, holineſſe of Covenant, diſtinct from that of ſanctification, ſtand enſnared in none of theſe difficulties or inextricable perplexities.

All the following Arguments to the 9th. may be eaſily granted, and that is thus formed, *If the Apoſtles uſe to communicate the proper titles of the juſtified to all that are baptized, (till they ſee them prove apoſtates or hypocrites) then they did take all the baptized to be probably juſtified, (though they might know that there were hypocrites among them, yet either they knew them not; or might not denominate the body from a few that they did know) But the antecedent is true; Therefore.* For the truth of the antecedent here laid down, [That the Apoſtles uſe to communicate the proper titles of the juſtified to all that are baptized,] I expect better proof then a naked affirmation. And all that is brought for proof, is, *I need not cite Scripture to prove, that the baptized are called by the Apoſtles Believers, Saints, Diſciples, Chriſtians; Mr.* Bl. *hath done it already*, pag. 28. And he very well knowes that I there make it good, That thoſe titles are not proper to the juſtified, but ordinarily given to thoſe that are not juſtified, nor

Titles given by Apoſtles do not argue that in their thoughts they were alwaies anſwered with inherent grace.

nor in any ſaving condition. But if my words in the place quoted, or elſewhere may not be heard, Mr. *Baxters* ſure will take, who in his Saints reſt, Part 4. Sect. 3. p. 105. ſaith, *There are many Saints (or ſanctifyed men) that yet ſhall never come to heaven, who are onely Saints by their ſeparation from Paganiſme into fellowſhip with the viſible Church, but not Saints in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, by ſeparation from the ungodly into the fellowſhip of the myſticall body of Chriſt*, quoting theſe following Scriptures, *Heb.* 10. 29. *Deut.* 7.6. and 14. 2, 21. and 26. 19. and 28. 9. *Exod.* 19. 6. 1 *Cor.* 7. 13, 14. *Rom.* 11. 16. *Heb.* 3. 1. *compared with* verſ. 12. 1 *Cor.* 3. 17. and 14. 33. 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. *compared with* 11. 20, 21, *&c. Gal.* 3. 26. *compared with Gal.* 3. 3, 4. and 4. 11. and 5. 2, 3, 4. *John* 15. 2. His demand therefore to me is ſtrange: *Now who knows not that ſalvation is made the portion of Believers, Saints, Diſciples?* when he himſelf affirms that there are Saints that never ſhall be ſaved. He afterwards puts a further queſtion, *Is it another ſort of them?* or *doth the Scripture uſe to divide Saints as a genus into two ſpecies? Not that I know of: It is but an æquivocum in ſua æquivocata. The name belongs to them but as the name of a Man to a Corps, &c.* Then it ſeems that there is nothing of Reality in ſuch Separations. *Camero* tells us otherwiſe, that *there is a reality in this Saintſhip by ſeparation.* In the relation of his diſpute with *Courcellius* he affirmed, that *the Text of the Apoſtle*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *was without doubt to be underſtood of reall holineſſe.* To which *Courcellius* replying, *He that is really holy hath no need of regeneration and baptiſme: But Infants of Believers after they are born have need of baptiſme and regeneration; Ergo.* Which *Camero* anſwered, (as the relation ſayes) by diſtinguiſhing of real holineſſe, which is twofold: *One conſiſting in the bare relation of the perſon to the people of God, or the Church, and depends wholly upon birth within the pale of the Church, and of parents embracing the Covenant. The other is*, &c. And it ſeems that the Scripture is ſtill under the charge of equivocal ſpeeches all over. As *Camero* hath ſomewhere obſerved, that *the word Saints in Scripture is far more frequently taken for Saints on Earth, then for Saints in heaven*; ſo I doubt not but it may be maintained that it ſpeaks far more frequently of Saints by dedication, and ſeparation, and ſo of Believers and Diſciples by profeſſion, then by inherent qualification; and doth it in all theſe places ſpeak equivocally? had it been affirmed to be *Genus Analogum*,

in

in oppoſition to *univocum*, as is ſaid of *Ens* in reſpect of *Subſtantia & Accidens*, it had been leſſe; but to make nothing of this noble priviledge of which Scripture ſpeaks ſo honourably, is too plainly to ſide againſt the truth it ſelf. I would know for my learning, what advantage or profit a dead Corps is in Capacity to enjoy; I think none at all: but theſe (as the Apoſtle tells us) have much every way, even they that have no more then ſanctity of this nature; If ſuch equivocation be found in the word [Saint] then the like is to be affirmed of the word Believer, and believers having their denomination from their faith, that is equivocal in like manner, and ſo our Common diviſion of faith into dogmatical or hiſtorical, temporary, miraculous, and juſtifying, is but a diviſion of an *æquivocum in ſua æquivocata*, which I ſhould think no man would affirm, much leſſe Mr. *Baxter*, who makes *common and ſpecial graces to differ onely gradually*, and then as cold in a remiſſe degree may grow to that which is intenſe, ſo one *æquivocatum* may riſe up to the nature of another, *animal terreſtre* may become *Sidus cœleſte*; one of our dogs that we uſe on Earth, may become a ſtar in heaven; then miraculous faith it ſelf hath onely the name, and nothing of the power and nature of faith in it. *Judas* had power given him to caſt out unclean ſpirits, *Matth.* 10. 1, 4. and he never had faith that juſtifieth; if his faith was onely æquivocal, then the unclean Spirits were equivocall likewiſe; I ſhall never believe that an æquivocal faith can caſt out a real devil. The Apoſtle tells us of faith to the remooval of Mountains void of charity, 1 *Cor.* 13. 2. If this were equivocall *faith*, thoſe muſt be equivocal *Mountains*. Mr. Baxter addes, *To put the matter beyond doubt, I wiſh Mr. Bl. to conſider that it's not onely theſe forementioned titles, but even the reſt which he will acknowledge proper to the regenerate, which are given by the Apoſtles generally to the baptized. Inſtances given in Adoption*, Gal. 3. 26, 27. *union with Chriſt and ſeveral others*. If I will acknowledge this, I ſhall be ſoon brought to yield up all. Is all Adoption proper to the regenerate? what ſhall we ſay then to that of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 4. *To them pertained the Adoption?* Had the Apoſtle that heavineſſe and continual ſorrow of heart, for Iſrael after the fleſh, and doth he yet give them that teſtimony that they are regenerate? *Gomarus* on the place hath theſe words, *Leſt any in this place ſhould miſtake, Adoption and acceptation for ſons in Scripture is twofold, general and*

Scripture Language real and not æquivocal.

and ſpecial. General adoption is an outward deſtination or call into the viſible Church and Company of the Sons of God, upon which account many are ſaid to be the Sonnes of God, as oppoſite to the Sonnes of men, that is, aliens from the Church, Gen. 6. 2. *And Iſrael this general way are called the ſons of God, not onely thoſe that were elect to life eternall and regenerate, but alſo thoſe that were reprobate and meerly carnal, and therefore the Jewes, Sons of the kingdome, or the Church of God, are ſaid to be caſt into utter darkneſſe,* Matth. 8. 12. And whether all union with Chriſt imply regeneration, let *John* 15. 2. be conſulted, where an union with Chriſt is cleerly held out; yet Mr. *Baxter* brings that text among others to prove that there are ſome Saints that ſhall never be ſaved. Mr. *Hudſon* and Mr. *Cobbet* tell us at large that, *Chriſt is the head of the Church viſible, and hath many unfruitful members.* Other phraſes are there brought, or titles as proper to the regenerate; which are well known in Scripture to be applyed to ſuch as have Apoſtatized, and are brought by *Arminians* to prove falling away, and are anſwered by their adverſaries; Mr. *Hudſons* words are here worthy of conſideration. *Onely the inviſible company have internal ſpiritual communion, and are elect, many of thoſe that have external communion and are viſible members ſhall periſh, and yet by reaſon of their profeſſion, are ſaid,* 2. Theſ. 1. 1. *to be in God the Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as* Ames *alſo confeſſeth, Med. lib.* 1. *Cap.* 32. *art.* 9. *Such was the Church off Corinth and Epheſus, &c. wherein all were not in Communion for life; and of ſuch Chriſt ſpeaketh,* John 15. 2. *Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he takes away. and verſe* 6. *If a man abides not in me, he is caſt forth as a branch, and is withered, and men gather them and caſt them into the fire, and they are burned. Theſe are ſaid to be redeemed,* 2 Pet. 2. 1. *denying the Lord that bought them; and ſanctified,* Heb. 10. 29. *yet hath accounted the blood of the Covenant, wherewith he was ſanctified, an unholy thing,* and much more to this purpoſe, Vindi. pag. 5. And if the Apoſtle give Teſtimonies to whole Churches holding out what they ingage to be, ought to be, and profeſſedly were, this comes ſhort of his purpoſe.

Humane authorities vouched.

I find little or nothing in all the other Arguments but that which either looks not at all towards any thing that I hold, or elſe is already ſpoken to. His laſt onely from humane authority is obſervable. *Our Divines againſt the Papiſts* (ſaith he) *do generally plead that Hypocrites are not true members of the univerſal*

verſal Church, but as a wooden leg is to the body. I muſt tell him that if they be Members of a particular Church then they are true members of the Church univerſal, Taking univerſal and particular in a Similar homogeneal way for the viſible Church ſtate, as we muſt take them if we ſpeak any thing to purpoſe. That which is *pars partis*, is *pars totius*, if my finger be a part of my hand, it is a part of my body, and if Mr. *Baxter* be an Inhabitant of *Kederminſter*, then he is an Inhabitant of *Worceſterſhire*, and if of *Worceſterſhire*, then an Inhabitant of *England*; and let us ſee what they ſay of the Church viſible indefinitely. Lord *Dupleſſe* in his Treatiſe of the Church, pag. 3. ſaith, *The inviſible Church conteineth none but the good, the viſible containeth both the good and the bad; that onely the Elect, this all thoſe indifferently that are brought into her by the preaching of the truth.* [e] Wollebius ſaith, pag. 194. *the viſible Church is a company joyntly called as well of Elect as Reprobate.* [f] Ravanellus in verb. Eccleſ. *The viſible Church conſiſts not onely of the Elect and truely Godly, but alſo of reprobates, and Hypocrites.* [g] Gomarus Analyſis, in 2 Theſ. 2. *Our Divines underſtand the Church univerſal not inviſible (which onely contains the elect and truely faithful, of which Chriſt ſpeaks*, Matth. 16.) *but the viſible which conſiſts of Elect and Reprobate.*

[e] Viſibilis Eccleſia eſt cœtus communiter vocatorum tum electorum tum reproborum

[f] Eccleſia viſibilis conſtat non ſolum ex electis & vere piis, ſed etiam ex reprobis & Hypocritis.

[g] Noſtri Eccleſiam univerſalem non inviſibilem (quæ ſolos electos & vere fideles complectitur, de qua Chriſtus loquitur. Matth. 16.) ſed viſibilem quæ electis & hypocritis conſtat intelligunt.

Mr. Hudſon, Vindication, pag. 7. *In the ſame ſenſe, that a viſible Church may be called a Myſtical body of Chriſt, Chriſt may be alſo called a Myſticall head thereof, as Chriſt terms himſelf a Maſter, ſo he hath evil, ſloathful ſervants, and ſtewards, as a King he hath rebells that will not have him to rule over them, even in his Church*, Matth. 25. 6. giving like inſtance, *as a ſhepherd, as an houſeholder, as a bridegroom, a husbandman, a fiſherman, a vine*, adding, Chriſt ſaith, *My people are fooliſh, they have not known me, ſottiſh children, &c.* [h] Pareus, *Revelation* 3. 1. *The Church of the called is one conſiſting promiſcuouſly of good and bad, faithful and hypocrites, the Church of the elect is another conſiſting of Elect and truely faithful, which indeed are of the ſame company of thoſe that are called.* Ameſ. Anti Bel. T. 2. lib. 2. Cap. 1. not. 5. when *Bellarmine* had ſtated the controverſy between his party, and his adverſaries, Others he ſaies require inward virtues, to make any

[h] Alia eſt Eccleſia vocatorum promiſcue bonis & malis, fidelibus & hypocritis conſtans, Alia eſt Eccleſia electorum vere fidelium qui quidem in cœtu vocatorum ſunt.

a Church member, [i] *But we (*ſaith he*) do not think that any inward virtue is required to make a man in ſome ſort a part of that true Church of which the Scripture ſpeaks.* After diſcovery of his ſophiſtry in the word after a ſort, poſitively anſwers, [k] *It is falſe that inward vertues are required of us to put a man into the Church according to the viſible ſtate of it.* Abundant more like Teſtimonies might be added if it would not be the Readers trouble. And leſt all of this ſhould be evaded with this diſtinction, that reſpective to us they are members, but they are not ſo in *foro Dei*, let us ſee what [l] *Apollonius* hath in his anſwer to the queſtion concerning qualification of Church-members. He ſaith, *The reformed Churches diſtinguiſh between the inviſible Myſticall Church of Chriſt which is the company of believers, called, which have Communion with Chriſt, to which no hypocrite can be joyned, &c. And the outward viſible Church, which is the ſociety of thoſe that profeſſe the true faith for the exerciſe of Eccleſiaſtical Communion and ſociety among themſelves.* And having expreſſed his judgement, as to the queſtion, proves it by three Arguments. *The* 3[d]. *is* [m] *from the deſcription of the Church viſible whoſe nature in the right of God is deſcribed (ſaith he) that it is a barne in which chaffe is gathered with the wheat, the houſe of God in which are veſſels of Gold and wood, a net in which are fiſhes good and bad.* This diſtinction therefore as thus applyed is here by *him* denyed, and to this end we may examine further the definitions given by Divines of the viſible Church: A definition compriſeth no parts that are Monſtrous, adventitious, Excrementitious or barely equivocal, but thoſe onely that are of the eſſence or at leaſt integrality where it is an Integrum, as the Church (as Mr. *Hudſon* hath ſhewed) is, that is defined. We have heard *Wollebius* his definition before. Mr. *Hudſon*, pag. 9[th]. ſaith, *The Church viſible is a company of people, called or ſeparated by God, from Idols to the true Religion: and yeelding profeſſed ſubjection to that call, which is true (ſaith he) of the godly as well as of the Hypocrites.* The *Leyden* Profeſſours, diſput. 40. Theſ. 32. give this definition. [n] *The viſible Church is a Company of thoſe which by the outward Word*

[i] Nos autem ut aliquis aliquo modo dici poſſit pars veræ Eccleſiæ de qua Scripturæ loquuntur, non putamus requiri ullam internam virtutem.

[k] Falſum eſt, internas virtutes requiri à nobis, ut aliquis ſit in Eccleſia quoad viſibilem ejus ſtatum.

[l] Eccleſiæ Refor diſtinguunt inter Eccleſiam Chriſti inviſibilem myſticam; quæ cœtus eſt hominum vocatorum fidelium qui communionem habent cum Chriſto cui nulli hypocritæ annumerari poſſunt, & inter Eccleſiam Chriſti Viſibilem externam, quæ eſt ſocietas eorum qui veram hdem profitentur ad communionem & ſocietatem Eccleſiaſticam inter ſe exercendam.

[m] Ex deſcriptione Eccleſiæ viſibilis cujus natura deſcribitur in jure Dei, quod ſit horreum in quo cum tritico & paleæ colliguntur, domus Dei in qua vaſa aurea & ligne a ſunt, rete quo piſces boni & mali capiuntur.

[n] Viſibilis Eccleſia eſt cœtus eorum qui per verbum externum, Sacramentorum ac diſciplinæ Eccleſiaſticæ uſum, in unum externum corpus coaleſcunt.

Word and uſe of Sacraments and Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, are gathered into one outward body and ſociety. Explaining themſelves in the 35. *Theſ.* in the ſame manner as Mr. *Hudſon* before. The definition of *Trelcatius* junior little differs from it, pag. 432. And wheras Mr. *Baxter* ſaith, *that our Divines generally plead that Hypocrites are not true members of the univerſal Church, but as a wooden Legge to the body*; I am almoſt confident that in turning over all his books, he can produce but few ſuch Teſtimonies. Had he ſaid the Catholick Church inſtead of univerſal, I believe he might have found many, but whether he can find them ſpeaking in his terms, I ſomewhat queſtion. When *Whitaker* handles the queſtion ſo voluminouſly, he ſtates it of what ſort of men *the Catholick Church conſiſts*, but not univerſal. Dr. *John Reynolds*, maintaining that poſition, *The holy Catholick Church which we believe is the whole company of Gods Elect and Choſen*, expreſſeth himſelf by the word Catholick, as we ſee, in his Theſis, and addes, *The wicked muſt needs be a part of the Church, if the name of Church did ſignifie the viſible Church.* Now I think that ſcarce any will deny that the univerſal Church is viſible, which Mr. *Hudſon* ſo largely hath proved, cap. 5. Yet *Whitaker* as largely makes good that the Catholick Church is inviſible, *quæſt. 2. de Eccleſ.*. If I be now ſent to my Dictionary to ſee whether Catholick and univerſal be not both one, and demanded whether there be any more difference between them, then is between *Idolum* and *Imago*, about which we have had ſo much ſtir with the Papiſts, the one a Greek word, the other a Latine; I confeſſe it is ſo in Grammer, but not in their uſe of it that handle the queſtion of the Church Catholick in this manner, and when their Authority is quoted their ſenſe muſt be inquired into. And in caſe they took it for the ſame as univerſal, they could not make it inviſible, in which ſenſe *Hudſon* obſerves, *Zanchy, Gerard, Whitaker, Chamier, Ames, Dr. Willet*, do uſe it, to which *Davenant, Trelcatius*, with others might be added. The diſtinction is uſual into Catholick, and viſible, and in that ſenſe a wicked man is no member of the Church Catholick, as oppoſite to viſible, when yet he is a true Member of the Church univerſal as oppoſite to particular; And therefore I ſay that a bad man is a true Member of the Church viſible, and I think I am not gainſayed by any of our Divines, but ſeconded. But though they may be true members of viſible Churches, yet perhaps Mr.

Univerſal and Catholick in Authors uſe of them diſtinguiſhed.

Baxter, hath a way to make them onely as woodden leggs respective to the true Church visible, Churches with him being no true Churches, but æquivocally so called, owning that Charge of *Bellarmines*, [o] where he saith, that *the Confessionists, and* Calvin *teach, that there are two Churches, A true one, which is the Congregation of the holy and faithfull: An outward one, which is onely a Church in name, in which good and bad are found, but the bad are in the Church, not of the Church:* But here he hath *Amesius* his adversary, who better understood the mind of Protestant Writers, and in this is rather to be believed. He answers, *Tom.* 2. *lib.* 2. *de Eccles. Cap.* 1. [p] *This fiction of two Militant Churches which is put upon them, is a manifest Calumny, they do not divide the Church Militant into two Species, but they distinguish and hold forth a double respect or consideration of one and the same Church: One according to the inward Essence, and the other according to the outward manner of Existence.* Yet this must be taken further into Consideration, seeing from this distribution of the Church, Mr. *Baxter* hath got up an Argument to prove visible Churches to be no Churches, which is his nineteenth Argument of his 26. and is thus framed: *If the distribution of the Church into visible and invisible be but of the subject into divers adjuncts, and not of a Genus into its Species, then that part or those Members, which are meerly visible, are indeed no part of the Members of the Church so distributed, but are onely Equivocally called a Church, Church-Members, &c.* The Antecedent must be yielded him; *the Consequence* (he saith) *is undeniable, in that adjuncts are no part of the Essence, much lesse the form, or the whole Essence; and therefore cannot denominate, but æquivocally, instead of the essence.*

To this I answer, the consequence might as fairly have been, that these members which are invisible, are no parts or members of the Church so distributed, seeing invisibility, or invisible (as is confest) is an adjunct as well as visibility or visible. There may be a distribution of man by hundreds of adjuncts, either corpulent or leane, high or low, black or fair, old or young, rich or poor, learned

[o] Confessionistæ & Calvinus, docent duas esse Ecclesias, veram quæ est Sanctorum fidelium Congregatio: & externam quæ nomine tantum est Ecclesia, in qua boni & mali reperiuntur: sed malos esse in Ecclesiâ, non de Ecclesiâ.

[p] Calumnia est manifesta, quod impingitur illis duarum Ecclesiarum Militantium fictio, non distribuunt Ecclesiam militantem in duas species: sed duplicem respectum aut considerationem unius & ejusdem Ecclesiæ distinguunt ac proponunt, unam quoad essentiam internam, & alteram quoad modum existendi externum.

learned or unlearned, &c. If one of theſe ſo denominated be a true man, ſhall the other then be onely æquivocally a man? If a corpulent man be a true man, is a leane man no man? If a tall, black or old man be a true man, ſhall then a low, fair or young man be no man? This muſt needs follow as well as the other. The reaſon given, *that adjuncts are no part of the Eſſence*, is not at all to the purpoſe, ſeeing the ſubject that is denominated by ſuch adjuncts, hath its Eſſence; though blackneſſe be not of the eſſence of a man, yet the man that is black hath his eſſence; and though viſibility be not of the eſſence of the Church, yet the Church which is denominated viſible hath its eſſence. And whereas we are warned to note, that *viſibile is not the ſame with viſum*; ſo I can give warning that *inviſibile*, is not the ſame with *non viſum*, though I know not to what purpoſe.

Secondly, I anſwer, the Church being an *integrum*, and that *per aggregationem*, and onely one, in exact propriety of ſpeech, it cannot be capable of any ſuch diſtribution: ſo there muſt be one Church of one denomination, and another of another, but it is a diſtribution of Church-members, which ſerve as parts to make up the whole: ſome of which are onely viſible, that is all their honour, to make a viſible profeſſion, and to enjoy the glory of Ordinances, and the Divine protection of God over his vineyard; upon which account they are nigh, when others are afar off. The other are inviſible members; As they have all the viſible honour before mentioned, ſo they have an addition of a far greater glory of inviſible graces. The former I take to be the Church moſt properly (though I know others are of another opinion) for two reaſons. 1. When the Church is an *integrum* (as Mr. *Hudſon* hath largely proved it) the viſible Church containes the whole, for the inviſible part is alſo viſible, inviſible reſpective to graces, but viſible reſpective to profeſſion and outward priviledges: The inviſible is onely one part, and ſo not the Church in its moſt proper ſignification. 2. The Scripture almoſt whereſoever it ſpeaks of a Church, takes it in this acception, and that which is the ordinary and common language of the holy Ghoſt, which he uſes moſt often, almoſt alwayes, is that which is moſt proper. Some have ſaid, that the word Church is not more then once taken for the Church inviſible, which is, *Heb.* 12. 23. *The Church of the firſt born.* If it ſhould be granted, that there is two or three places more, which will bear that

that acceptation of it, which is as much as can be pretended; yet I dare ſay, there is not one for twenty, where the Church is taken for the Church viſible: And is the language of Scripture ſtill all over æquivocal? When Chriſt ſayes, *The Kingdome of heaven is like to a man that ſowed good ſeed in his field; is like to a draw-net:* ſhall we ſay, the Kingdome of heaven æquivocally taken? *Stephen* ſayes, *This was he that was in the Church in the wilderneſſe;* muſt we underſtand it of the Church æquivocal? And when *Paul* gave *Timothy* a directory, how to behave himſelf *in the houſe of God,* which he ſayes, *is the Church of the living God;* muſt we underſtand it of a Church æquivocal? Such a one would be but a weak ground or pillar of the truth; we may ſay the ſame of abundant other places. If all theſe æquivocals be granted, it will ſhortly be queſtioned, whether there be any reality in Scripture language.

The Author vindicated from Arminianiſme.

As the authority of our Divines is produced againſt the Papiſts, ſo alſo their authority againſt the Arminians is brought forth. *Our Divines againſt the Arminians* (ſaith he) *do ſuppoſe the firſt act of believing to be the firſt time that God is as it were engaged to man in the Covenant of grace; and that it is dangerous to make God to be in actual Covenant with men in the ſtate of nature, though the conditional Covenant may be made to them, and though he hath revealed his decree, for the ſanctifying his elect.* That God is then firſt engaged for the graces of the Covenant I eaſily yeeld, for then the grand condition by the help of grace is put in by the ſoul. But let us here take up that which he is pleaſed to yield, and compare it with that which he hath put into the Index of his Treatiſe of Infant-Baptiſme, where he notes this as Mr. *T.* his Error; *That the Covenant whereof Baptiſme is the ſeal, is onely the abſolute Covenant made onely to the Elect, which pag.* 223. *he confutes.* And if men in the ſtate of nature be in that Covenant that Baptiſme ſeales, (*viz.*) the conditional Covenant, then men in the ſtate of nature, and ſhort of juſtifying faith, have right to Baptiſme. It follows, *In my opinion the tranſition is very eaſie from Mr.* Blakes *opinion to Arminianiſme, if not unavoidable ſave by retreat, or by not ſeeing the connexion of the conſequence to the antecedent.* When this was charged upon me by another hand, I was acquitted by Mr. *Br.* and he teſtified for me, that I had acquitted Mr. *M.* from any ſuch charge. I marvel therefore that now it ſhould

be

be faſtened upon me. But let us hear his reaſon, *For grant once that common faith doth* coram Deo *give right to Baptiſme, and it is very eaſie to prove, that it gives right to the end of Baptiſme, God having not inſtituted it to be an empty ſign to thoſe that have true right to it.* What is it that we hear, will it give immediate right to the end of Baptiſme? That may be eaſily ſaid, but I think hardly proved. It is no empty ſign, if in the right uſe of it, it may prove ſerviceable to it; I am ſure the Jew outwardly had right to the Oracles of God, and yet no immediate certain right to their end, which is to be the power of God to ſalvation. It will be an hard task, to prove the certainty of all their ſalvation, that in the right of God ſtand entitled to any Ordinance of his: the reaſon will hold of all as well as one, they are not empty and vain. The Jewes had right to Circumciſion in the fleſh, and none that was a Jew outwardly might neglect it, and yet were void of Circumciſion of the heart, or forgiveneſs of ſin. The concluſion is, *That it will be no hard matter to prove, that it is ſome ſpecial grace that is the end of Baptiſme, at leaſt remiſſion of ſin. And ſo upon the right uſe of common grace, God ſhould be in Covenant obliged to give them ſpecial grace, which is taken for Pelagianiſme.* It will far rather follow from that opinion, that a common and ſpecial grace differ onely gradually, not ſpecifically; According to that promiſe of our Saviour, *Matth.*13.12. *To him that hath ſhall be given,* which our Divines have ſtill underſtood of graces of the ſame, and not of a different kind: he that hath common graces and improves them, ſhall have a larger meaſure of thoſe graces; and he that hath ſpiritual graces and improves them, ſhall have a more large meaſure of ſpiritual gifts. And if they be both of one kind, then Chriſts promiſe holds from the one to the other. It will be an hard matter I think to prove, that all that have right in Ordinances, though they make no right uſe, ſhall attain to the end of them.

Argument 5. *vindicated.*

An enquiry into *Simon Magus* his Baptiſme.

My fifth Argument was, [*That faith upon which Simon Magus was in the Primitive times baptized, is that which admitteth to Baptiſme: Simon himſelf believed and was baptized,* Acts 8. 13. *But Simons faith fell ſhort of ſaving and juſtifying.*] To which a ſudden anſwer is given, *Concedo totum, ſed deſideratur Concluſio.*

He

He is certainly much to ſeek both in Syllogiſmes and Common reaſon that could not infer, and could not know that I left the Reader to infer, that, *Ergo* a faith that is ſhort of juſtifying, entitles to Baptiſme. And ſo I have the whole in queſtion yielded, and that which was once ſaid would make foul work in the Church if once granted. But as ſoon as it is yielded me, a Means is unkindly uſed to take it away from me. And it is further anſwered, *That may be ſaid to admit to Baptiſme which ſo qualifieth the perſon as that we are bound to baptize him, as being one that ſeemeth ſound in believing as Simon did.* If ſuch liberty of interpretation be yielded, who may not eaſily elude the ſenſe of any Scripture-Text? the Text ſaith, that *Simon believed, and was baptized*: Is it now enough for us to ſay he ſeemed to believe, and therefore thoſe whom he thus deceived were bound to baptize him? Let the whole Text be viewed, and the former Verſe taken in, and then let us ſee whether ſuch a Gloſſe be fair. *When they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the Kingdome of God, and the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, they were baptized both men and women. Then Simon himſelf believed alſo.* That faith upon which all the other *Samaritans* were admitted to Baptiſme, *Simon* was admitted upon alſo: But it was not a ſeeming to believe, but a believing that admitted the other *Samaritans*; Therefore it was believing, not a ſeeming to believe that admitted *Simon*. When the Holy Ghoſt ſaith, *Simon believed*, as he ſaith other Samaritans believed, and his faith ſatisfied *Philip*, full of the Holy Ghoſt, to give him admittance; How may we that ſtand at this diſtance dare to call it into queſtion? If the Seal were put to a meer blank paper, why is not all reverſed upon diſcovery of a Miſpriſion in proceeding? So any man would do that had put a Seal where no name was written. Why was not all *ipſo facto* made null? what reaſon could be given but that *Peter*, had he been of that mind, ſhould have ſaid, Repent of this thy wickedneſſe, that upon teſtimony given of thine integrity thou mayeſt yet be baptized? But when the Text ſayes he did believe, and *Philip* upon that account thus proceeded, and no retractation upon ſuch diſcovery was made, I believe no ſuch Gloſſe is to be ſuffered. My ſixth and laſt Argument was, [*In caſe onely juſtifying faith give admiſſion to Baptiſme, then none is able to baptize, ſeeing this by none is diſcerned.*] To which Mr. *Baxter* ſayes very little, but onely refers to what he hath ſaid to Mr. *Tombs*; and

I

I having had occaſion before, and may have occaſion hereafter to ſpeak of it, ſhall here make no further defence of it.

Additional Arguments, that a faith ſhort of that which juſtifies, gives title to Baptiſme.

SEeing theſe Arguments have given Mr. *Baxter* ſo little ſatisfaction, I ſhall endeavour to make ſome addition, onely premiſing this, That Baptiſme is our door of Entrance, or way of admiſſion into the Church viſible, which I ſhall take for granted, ſeeing Mr. *T.* pag. 54. of his Apology, as Mr. *Baxter* obſerves, hath yielded it; and Mr. *Baxter* to my hand, Treatiſe of Infant-Baptiſme, pag. 24. by Arguments hath proved it. If then I ſhall prove, that ſuch are to be received into the Church, I ſhall take the Concluſion to be the ſame as if they ſaid they were to be baptized; and proving their right to be taken into the Church, I prove their right to be baptized.

1. They that have right in the ſight of God, to many and great Priviledges of his gift, have right in his ſight to the firſt and leading priviledge; this I think cannot be denyed: Having a right to thoſe that follow, they have right to thoſe that lead. If any had in the time of the Law right to the Paſſeover, they had right to Circumciſion; and if any now have right to the Lords Supper, they have right to Baptiſme. But thoſe of a faith that is ſhort of that which juſtifies, have right to many and great priviledges in the ſight of God. This is clear from the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 3.1. The Jew outwardly where Circumciſion of heart was wanting, had every way much profit and advantage, he had therefore right to Circumciſion, and thoſe with him that are ſhort of a faith that juſtifies, have right in the ſight of God to Baptiſme. *Arg.* 1.

2. Thoſe that are a people by Gods gracious diſpenſations, nigh unto God, comparative to others, have right in the ſight of God to viſible admittance to this more near relation This I think is clear, Men have right to be admitted to their right. But thoſe that come ſhort of juſtifying faith, are a people by Gods gracious diſpenſation nigh unto God comparative to others; this is plain in the whole viſible Nation of the Jewes, as appeares, *Deut.* 4. 7. *Pſal.* 147. 19, 20. & 148. 14. Thoſe therefore that *Arg.* 2.

that are short of justifying faith, have right in the sight of God to Admission to this nearer relation.

*Arg.*3. 3. Those that God ordinarily calls his People, and ownes as his, openly avouching himself to be their God, have right in the sight of God to the Signs and Cognisance of his people, and are to have admission into the Society and fellowship of his people. This is plain, If God in Covenant will own Servants, then his stewards may open the door to them; if he will own sheep, his servants doubtlesse may mark them. But God owns all in visible Communion, though short of faith that is justifying, as his people, and openly avouches himself to be their God, as in abundant places of Scripture is evident: see *Deut.*26.18. these have therefore right to the signs and Cognisances of his people, to admission into the society and fellowship of his people.

*Arg.*4. 4. Those whom the Spirit of God ordinarily calls by the name of Circumcision, they had right in Gods sight to Circumcision; and those of like condition, have like right to Baptisme. This I think is clear; The Spirit of God doth not misname, doth not nickname, nor ordinarily at least give equivocal names. But men short of justifying faith, are called by the Spirit of God by the name of Circumcision as needs no proof. *Christ was a Minister of the Circumcision*, Rom.15.8. and he was sent to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*. Those then of a faith short of that which is justifying, have right in the sight of God to Baptisme.

*Arg.*5. 5. Those that are the servants of God, whom God owns as his servants, have right in his sight to be received into his house, and to be entitled to the priviledges of his Church. This we think should not be denyed, and that God will take it ill, if any shall deny it. But men short of that faith which justifies, are owned of God as his servants, as is clear, *Levit.*25.41,42. There every *Israelite* that was sold to any of the children of *Israel*, and his children are called of God his servants, and that as *Israelites*; of which a great part were void of that faith which justifies. Therefore those that are short of faith which justifies, have right in the sight of God to be thus received. This argument me thinks might be of force with Mr. *Baxter*. when he had urged it for proof, that infants are servants, and ought to be baptized, he adds, pag.18. *Is not here then direction enough to help us to judge of the mind of God, whether infants are his Disciples,*

and

and ſervants or no? Doth not God call them his ſervants himſelf? What more ſhould a man expect to warrant him to do ſo? Men call for plain Scripture, and when they have it, they will not receive it: ſo hard it is to informe a foreſtalled mind. If God took ſuch care upon that account, that they ſhould not be held in bondage under any of his people; he takes like care that they ſhould not be kept from the ſociety of his people.

6. Thoſe that bring forth children to God, have a right in the ſight of God to be of his houſhold, and to be taken into it; This is plain, eſpecially to thoſe that know the law of ſervants in families, that all their children in right were the Maſters, and had their relation to him. But thoſe that are ſhort of juſtifying faith bring forth children to God, *Ezek.*16.20,21. *Arg.* 6.

7. Children of the Kingdom of God, or thoſe that are ſubjects of his Kingdom, have right in the ſight of God to be receivcd into his Kingdom. This Propoſition Mr. *Br.* hath proved, pag.21. therefore I may ſave my pains. But thoſe that are ſhort of faith that juſtifies, are children or ſubjects of this Kingdom, *Matth.*8.12. *The children of the Kingdom ſhall be caſt out into outer darkneſſe.* Thoſe therefore that are ſhort of juſtifying faith have right in the ſight of God to be thus received. *Arg.* 7.

8. The children of the Covenant have right in the ſight of God to the ſeal of the Covenant: This is evident, the ſeal is an affix to the Covenant: where a Covenant is made, and a ſeal appointed, there it is not of right to be denyed. But thoſe that are ſhort of faith that juſtifies are the children of the Covenant, *Act.*3.25. The Apoſtle ſpeaking to the people of the Jewes, ſaith, *Ye are the children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our fathers.* *Arg.*8.

9. Diſciples of Chriſt have right in the ſight of God to Baptiſme, as appears in Chriſts Commiſſion, *Matth.*28.19. But many are Diſciples of Chriſt, that are ſhort of a faith that juſtifies. Therefore thoſe that are ſhort of faith that juſtifies, have right in the ſight of God to Baptiſme. If all that I have ſaid, pag.208. of the Treatiſe of the Covenant, to prove this aſſumption be too weak, as I think it is not, Mr. *Brs.* proof pag. 21. of his Treatiſe hath ſure ſtrength ſufficient; there he proves that infants are Diſciples, becauſe they are ſubjects of Chriſts Kingdom, and what Kingdom he means, he there explaines himſelf. *Arg.*9.

I ſpeak not here (ſaith he) *of his Kingdom in the largeſt ſenſe, as it containeth all the world; nor yet in the ſtricteſt, as it containeth only his Elect: But in the middle ſenſe as it containeth the Church viſible, as it is moſt commonly uſed:* And therefore by the way not æquivocally uſed. Thoſe then of this middle poſture non-Elect are Diſciples.

*Arg.*10. 10. Chriſtians have right in the ſight of God to Baptiſme. This is Mr. *Brs.* propoſition in the page before quoted, and in reaſon is plain, Chriſtians muſt not be kept out of Chriſtian fellowſhip. This is Mr. *Baxters* likewiſe in the place quoted, he makes *Diſciples Chriſtians, and ſubjects of Chriſts viſible Kingdom, to be one and the ſame.* Therefore thoſe that are ſhort of juſtifying faith, have right in the ſight of God to Baptiſme. If he object that that particle in the ſight of God is an addition, they have no ſuch right being but æquivocal Chriſtians: yet as is the Chriſtian with him, ſo is the Church or Kingdom, as æquivocal Chriſtians, they may have right to an æquivocal Church or Kingdom.

*Arg.*11. 11. All that ought to be admitted viſible Church members, ought to be admitted in the right of God to Baptiſme. This none can queſtion, unleſſe they charge it as Tautological, and it is Mr. *Brs.* pag.23. and the medium of that argument which he makes the chief of all he uſeth. But thoſe that are ſhort of juſtifying faith are members of the Church viſible. *Ergo* thoſe that are ſhort of juſtifying faith, are to be admitted to Baptiſme. The aſſumption is his likewiſe, where he diſtinguiſheth the viſible Kingdom from the Elect, and no man can deny it that grants the diſtinction of a Church into viſible and inviſible.

*Arg.*12. 12. The children of God have right in the ſight of God to be admitted to baptiſme; This is clear enough: But men ſhort of juſtifying faith are children of God, even thoſe that drew down judgements on the Old world, as, *Gen.*6.2. The whole body of the children of *Iſrael*, *Deut.*14.1. Thoſe that moſt provoked God amongſt them; Thoſe that revolted from Chriſt, for whom *Paul* had ſo much heavineſſe in the fleſh, *Rom.* 9.4. If the way of their adoption, or ſonſhip be queſtioned; doubtleſſe it is ſuch as hath with it an inheritance, for a child is not adopted, but to be provided for. And what inheritance can be conceived, but Church priviledges? Greater will not be yeelded, and leſſer to one thus related cannot be aſſigned, and what priviledge

viledge can be inherited if there be no door of admittance to it? Thoſe therefore that are ſhort of juſtifying faith have right in the ſight of God to Baptiſme.

13. Thoſe whom God ingraffs by his power into the true Olive, and makes partakers of the fatneſſe of the Olive, they have right in the ſight of God to be admitted. This is plain, God engraffing right muſt not be denyed: But he engraffs by his power thoſe that are ſhort of that faith that juſtifies; even the whole body of the Church of the Gentiles, and we expect the like of the Church of the Jewes, as appears from the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 11. Therefore thoſe that are ſhort of a juſtifying faith, have right in the ſight of God to Baptiſme. I had thought to have ended here, but let me add two more. *Arg.* 13.

14. All of thoſe that profeſſedly imbrace a Goſpel tender, in which there is a conditional promiſe of Juſtification, Adoption, Glorification, have right in the ſight of God to all Ordinances, ordinarily neceſſary, and requiſite to bring them up to theſe conditions; and to the fruition of theſe glorious priviledges, and conſequently to baptiſme the leading priviledge. This none can deny, that know the readineſs of Chriſt, in imparting ſaving Ordinances to a people. But thoſe that are ſhort of faith which is juſtifying, may imbrace a Goſpel-tender, in which there is a conditional promiſe of Juſtification, Adoption, Glorification. Thoſe therefore that are ſhort of faith which is juſtifying, have right in the ſight of God to all ſuch Ordinances, and conſequently to Baptiſme. *Arg.* 14.

15. If the Apoſtle argue for a right to Baptiſme, from gifts that are common to the juſtified and unjuſtified, then faith which is ſhort of juſtifying, gives right in the ſight of God to Baptiſme. This none can deny, unleſs they will call the Apoſtles Logick into queſtion, and deny his conſequence. But the Apoſtle thus argues for a right to Baptiſme; from thoſe gifts that are common to the juſtified and unjuſtified; this is plain, *Act.* 10. 47. *Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have received the holy Ghoſt as well as we?* The holy Ghoſt there, is the gift of the holy Ghoſt then poured out; the gift of tongues, as in the 45. and 46. verſes is held forth: which is a gift not onely inferiour to charity, but ſuch as may be ſever'd from it, 1 *Cor.* 13. 1. A gift of that kind, that men of a miraculous faith ordinarily did, as in an inſtant confer. They are *Arg.* 15.

therefore

therefore gifts common to the juſtified and unjuſtified. Thoſe therefore of faith ſhort of that which is juſtifying have right to Baptiſme.

Arg. 16. 16. *If the promiſe be to others beſides believers then ſo is the ſeal; for to whom God promiſeth, to them he engageth himſelf to perform. But the promiſe is to others: Therefore the ſeal is to others. This will be evident, if it be once underſtood, that it is onely the conditional Covenant which God ſealeth by the Sacraments; for this promiſe is made to unbelievers, though the good promiſed is not to be enjoyed by any but thoſe that perform the condition.*

Arg. 17. 17. *If God do no more in his actual ſealing to believers then he doth when the Sacrament is rightly applyed to hypocrites, then he actually ſealeth to hypocrites: But God doth no more in his actual ſealing to believers then he doth when the Sacrament is rightly adminiſtred to hypocrites. The Minor is proved by the enumeration of the ſeveral acts.* 1. *God maketh a promiſe.* 2. *He commandeth Miniſters to publiſh it.* 3. *He hath inſtituted the Sacraments, as mutually engaging ſigns or ſeals.* 4. *He commands Miniſters to deliver or apply them to thoſe that profeſſe their conſent and deſire to enter or renew the Covenant.* Theſe two laſt I confeſſe I have borrowed, and that from Mr. *Br.* pag. 223. of his Infant-Baptiſme, and whether they make for him or againſt him, to prove or diſprove their right which he here calls hypocrites, and diſtinguiſhes from believers, I leave to the cenſure of the intelligent Reader.

Mr. Baxters *Arguments reviewed, and his Vindication examined. Argument* 1.

Matth. 28. 19. Vindicated. MR. *Baxter* argues, *When Chriſt ſaith, Make me Diſciples of all Nations, baptizing them, he meant ſincere diſciples, though we cannot know them to be ſincere.* I have anſwered, that this diſcipleſhip which Chriſt here mentions is ſuch, of which whole Nations are in a Capacity, which was made plain by the Commiſſion, concluding. If whole Nations, yea, the whole univerſal viſible Church (conſiſting of diſcipled Nations) were all believers, it were a great happineſſe, Chriſt on the contrary ſaith, *Many are called, but few choſen.* Mr. *Baxter* replyes, *If it be not ſincere diſciples that Chriſt means in that Text, Then no Apoſtle was bound by that Commiſſion and great Precept, to endea-*

vour

vour the making of ſincere Diſciples; but onely counterfeits, and half Chriſtians: But the Antecedent is falſe: Therefore. I am ſorry to hear the Conſtitution of viſible Churches to ſuffer this brand of making counterfeit, and half Chriſtians. It is well known whoſe Language it is, That all charging or urging of duty upon unregenerate perſons, is onely to bring them to hypocriſie. Do not all know that the means neceſſarily conducible muſt be uſed in order to the end propoſed? In order to make men ſincere diſciples, they muſt be made viſible profeſſing diſciples. They may be half Chriſtians (if Mr. *Baxter* will have it ſo) in order to whole Chriſtians. *Dr. Ames* (if I do not miſremember) *compares viſible Churches to rough ſtones taken out of the quarry, and inviſible Chriſtians to ſtones hewed and poliſhed;* I am ſure they muſt be taken out of the quarry to be put into the building. It is ſaid, that *Melanchton* uſed to wiſh, that there were more hypocrites in the world, then there were; not that he would have more diſſembling among thoſe that made profeſſion of Chriſtianity, but more brought in to make profeſſion. Profeſſion being a good ſtep in the way to ſincerity, which a man would think Mr. *Baxter* would not diſlike, who ſo far ſpeaks the mind of Chriſt towards men, that *if they will come but onely to a viſible profeſſion, he will not deny them admittance there, becauſe they intend to go no further, but will let them come as neer as they will.* And what he ſayes of Chriſts readineſſe for admittance, I may ſay of Miniſters endeavours, they muſt bring them thus far, in order to a greater work. Miniſters are to be inſtrumental by the work of regeneration to make men babes in Chriſt, and by remiſſe heat reſembling ſmoaking flax, to bring them up to greater fervour; Shall we thence infer, that they are to make men luke-warm, which is a temper that Chriſt will not bear? We therefore diſtinguiſh of luke-warmneſſe: 1. As a *medium* to further heat, ſo Miniſters muſt bring men up to it. 2. As a *terminus*, or end in which men reſt: So conſidered, a Miniſters work is to bring men beyond it; the ſame we may ſay of a viſible profeſſion, as a *medium*, not as a *terminus*, it muſt be all Miniſters endeavours. Mr. *Baxter* cannot be ignorant that Mr. *Marſhall*, and others that are for Infant-Baptiſme, have proved, (and Mr. *Tomb's* hath yielded) That this inlarged Commiſſion given here to the Apoſtles, is put in oppoſition to their limited Commiſſion, *Matth.* 10.5,6. They were firſt ſent unto a Nation diſciple to their

their hands; entring, as Christ tells them, into other mens labours, what that Nation was, they must by their endeavors work all to be. That was a Nation of professed disciples, and hither they are by their Commission to bring all Nations. Mr. *Baxter* addes, *For your Argument, I grant the Conclusion, and what would ye have more?* I wish no more, so that you will stand to your word, and then visible disciples, of which whole Nations consist, according to Christs Commission, have right to Baptisme, and I think that is the thing in Question. He yet saith, *I grant the Minor, taking the word disciples equivocally, as a Corps is called a man, and I confesse it usual so to take the word, but otherwise I deny the Minor.* But I abhor that acceptation. Honest-meaning men do not use to say so, much lesse the Holy Ghost, as though I should say, that I had kept twenty men in my house these twenty years, and then come off with a tale of twenty pictures. I assert a reality in that discipleship which you call æquivocal: As for that which followes, *To be Christs Disciple (as to the Aged) is to be one that hath unfeignedly taken Christ for his Master to teach him and rule him, renouncing the contrary guidance of the flesh, the devill, and the world, &c.* This is true as to the Inheritance of heaven, but not as to Inheritance of Ordinances; in order to the further work of sincerity, that qualifies for heaven. The Jew outwardly was not thus qualified, and yet he had upon that account just title to Church-priviledges, and in particular to Circumcision. There followes to your Confirmation, *I deny the Minor, and I say that it is so new a doctrine to affirm, that whole Nations are not capable of being sound believers, that it deserved one word of proof: Much lesse should you have hid your Minor, and turned it into a Negatio Existentiæ, when it should have been but a Negatio Capacitatis: Doth it follow that a Nation is not capable of sound faith, because they have it not? or will not have it?* and afterwards you say, *If there be any Nation uncapable of faith, then God cannot make them believers.* And so in conclusion you will have stones to be in this capacity, for God can make them disciples, as well as he can of *them raise up Children to Abraham.* But you might easily know that I intended a Capacity to be brought into this state in Gods ordinary regular way by the Apostles Ministry. And, Chap. 27. pag. 194. I had before thus explained my self, *That which a whole Nation in Gods ordinary way of administration is in a Capacity to attain, and enter into, is onely*

onely a Covenant profeſſed, viſibly entred upon, and doth not require any inward change or work upon the ſoul to the being of it. This is plain, it cannot be expected in Gods ordinary way, that a Nation ſhould be brought forth at once, all inwardly holy and ſanctified, ſuch a field without tares hath not been ſeen, ſuch a floor without chaffe, ſuch a draw-Net without any fiſh that's bad; ſuch a feaſt and none without a wedding Garment. So that this is a doctrine ſo clear, that proof needs not, where there never ſhall be any futuriety we may well and fairly ſpeak of an incapacity. Capacity is vain when it is known and confeſt, Exiſtence ſhall never follow: But there muſt never be any ſuch exiſtence, as appears in Chriſts and the Apoſtles Parables of mixtures in viſible Churches, and hitherto all ages have had experience. Whereas you ſay, *Do you think Preachers yet be not bound to indeavour the ſaving converſion of whole Nations? If you ſay, No; you take them off the work their Maſter hath ſet them on. If you ſay, Yea: Then you think they muſt indeavour to perſwade men to that which they have not a Capacity of.* I think they are to bring them if heathens to a viſible profeſſion, and as many as may be to thorow converſion. That is ſomewhat remarkable which followes, *Vocation uneffectual is common to Pagans. Vocation throughly Effectual is of the ſame extent with juſtification, and I think Election.* A Pagan called according to Scripture, is a Contradiction *in adjecto.* Calling in Scripture-phraſe is not a bare tender, but accompanied with a profeſſed anſwer. That ſpeech of Chriſt, *Many are called, but few choſen,* is the cloſe of two Parables, *Matth.* 20. 16. & 22. 14. the one of Labourers called into the vineyard, the other of Gueſts called to the wedding. And in both applyed to them that anſwered to the Call, that came and laboured in the vineyard, that came with other bidden ones to the Feaſt, and not to thoſe that refuſed. According to this doctrine there is no Medium between a Pagan and a juſtified man, all Pagans and unjuſtified men are upon the ſame terms, the Jew outwardly (whatſoever St. *Paul* ſaith to the contrary) hath no profit or advantage above the heathen. When the Pſalmiſt gives that Elogy to the children of *Iſrael*, a people near unto the Lord, *Pſal.* 148. 14. the ſame may be ſaid of every Pagan that is an alien from the Common-Wealth of *Iſrael*, if once he hath manifeſted ſo much ſtubbornneſſe as to refuſe a Goſpel-tender. Scripture makes viſible Church-Members nigh,

when others are afar off, *Ephes.* 2. 13. and in visible Churches some according to Scriptures are more nigh then others, *Mark* 12. 34. when yet both are in an unjustified Condition.

Argument 2. reviewed.

Mar. 16. 16. vindicated.

Mr. *Baxters* second Argument to prove, that onely justifying Faith gives title to Baptisme is thus laid down, *When he saith, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, here Faith goes before Baptisme, and that not a common, but a saving faith; for here is but one faith spoken of, and that is before Baptisme.* I have answered, that this is the weakest of all Arguments, to reason for a precedency of one before another from the order in which they are placed in Scripture, and gave divers Instances not needful to repeat. Upon which Mr. *Baxter* confesseth, *there may be an Hysteron Proteron*: and then if Hysterons and Proterons be any a thing to our present purpose, it rests upon him to prove that here is none. 2. I know not how this figure of Rhetorick came to be talked on, I think no such thing is here to be asserted. So I should say Baptisme doth alwaies lead, and Faith follow. I onely said that all that can be collected hence, is, that in Gods ordinary way of conferring salvation we must have both Faith and Baptisme, though (as our Divines have generally observed against the Papists) there is not one and the same kind of necessity, which they confirm by the words that follow. If Mr. *Baxter* will contend for an exact order, then he must say that Faith alwaies precedes, and never followes after Baptisme, against the common observation, that sometimes it precedes, sometimes it accompanies, sometimes it followes, and he must also say that without inversion of a Divine order no baptized man can be converted to a Faith that is justifying; And then he may preach in *England* to build up Converts, but not to convert: or at least, when he hath converted, he must baptize his convert; the seal is null that goes before a Covenant. I gave instance in that place of Peter, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. where the restipulation or answer of a good conscience followes upon Baptisme, affirming that justifying Faith is that restipulation, or at least a principall branch of it; and therefore there is no necessity that it should precede; but a necessity that it should follow; In which I did not imply that a man before Baptisme may not believe, as I gave instance in *Abraham* to

the

the contrary, but that it tyeth him to the faith, at leaſt to follow after. Mr. *Baxter* ſaith, *I gratefully accept your Conceſſion, that juſtifying faith is that reſtipulation, which is your Minor, (that is, juſtifying faith profeſſed) and thence I conclude, that juſtifying faith is eſſential to the Mutual Covenant, and ſo without it God is not in Covenant with men. It is very well worth our enquiry how this can follow which is thus made good. Who knowes not that ever read Civil Law, that there is no ſtipulation ſine promiſſione, which you call, and ſo do other Divines, Reſtipulation. And that this Reſtipulation is an eſſentiall part of the Contract called ſtipulation, This being paſt doubt, it followes, that juſtifying faith being our Reſtipulation, is an Eſſential part of the Contract or Baptiſmall Covenant.* They onely (it ſeems) that have read the Civil Law, can ſee a neceſſity of this Concluſion. I, and other Divines, call this promiſe Reſtipulation; and I (though other Divines do not) ſay that juſtifying faith is this Reſtipulation or promiſe. And ſo the Promiſe being eſſential, Faith is eſſential to our being in Covenant likewiſe. But can Mr. *Baxter* think that it is the Promiſe or Reſtipulation ſtrictly ſo called, or that I ſo intended it? then this is a true Propoſition, juſtifying faith is a Promiſe; can any think that I ever intended ſo egregious a peece of affected nonſenſe? Juſtifying faith with me is the thing promiſed, or that to which we reſtipulate. Who that hath read Rhetorick, or heard any man ſpeak, doth not know that the promiſe is ordinarily put for the thing promiſed? and then the Concluſion will follow the clean contrary way. If you could prove out of the Civil Law or elſewhere, that there is no *Pollicitatio ſine Preſtatione*, that every man that enters Covenant *eo nomine* makes good his Covenant. Then you hit the nayl on the head, and till that is done, you have done nothing.

Arg. 3. *reviewed.*

Mr. *Baxters* third Argument is, *That faith to which the promiſe of remiſſion, and juſtification is made, muſt alſo be ſealed to (or that faith which is the Condition of the promiſe is the condition, in foro dei, of the title to the ſeal): But it is onely ſolid true faith which is the condition of the promiſe (of remiſſion): Therefore it is that which gives right, in foro Dei, to the ſeal.* To this I have anſwered, faith is not ſealed to, but remiſſion of ſins, or Salvation upon condition

In what ſenſe faith is the condition of the Promiſe.

condition of faith; and when I come to speak of the sealing of Sacraments, I shall God willing make this more evident, that the Sacrament *qua* seal immediately respects our priviledges, and not duties, and I referre the Reader thither. When I say a professor of faith may ingage to a lively working faith, I am followed with this Dilemma. *You mean either a professor of that lively faith or a professor of a dead, not working faith. If the first, it is a contradiction to say he professeth to have a lively faith, and he onely ingageth so to believe hereafter. For if he professe to have it already, then he can ingage onely to the continuation, and not to the inception of it. If you mean the latter, then I shall shew you anon, that a man professing a dead, not working faith, is not in Scripture called to Covenant with God in Baptisme, to believe lively for the future, (inceptivè) and to believe for the future with a working faith.* I shall first second this dilemma with another of like nature, and then answer. He that thus professeth to have a lively faith; either professeth it knowingly, so that he is assured that he speaks the truth, or with hæsitations, doubts and fears, so that he questions the truth of all that himself saies. The latter doubtlesse can give no title according to Mr. *Baxter*. For a man to professe, and remain wholly uncertain of the truth of such profession, can give no such title as is required; if the former be intended, that every man professing must know the truth of his profession, then none that are below assurance that in present they savingly believe, have any right to Baptisme, and then you see how high we are gone. Some think it is too much to require a full assurance of Grace from all that enter or are allowed to possesse their places in the Ministery, much more of all that enter into Christianity. For a direct answer, I therefore say, It is not profession to say that we have this faith, but a profession of our assent to the necessity of it, with ingagement to it that gives this title. There followes, *You suppose then, such a professor as this coming to Baptisme, saying, Lord, I believe that thou art God alone, and Christ the onely Redeemer, and the Holy Ghost the guide and sanctifier of thy people, and that the world, flesh and devil is to be renounced for thee: but at present there are lusts so deare to me, that I will not forsake them for thee. I will not take thee for my God, to rule me, or be my happinesse; nor will I take Christ to governe me, and save me in his way; nor will I be guided, or sanctified by the Holy Ghost; but hereafter I will, and therefore I come to be baptized.* If I say such have

right to baptiſme, and you ſay we are bound to baptize them, how do you mend the matter? do not you conclude your fourty ſixt Section with theſe words? *Vocation which is effectual onely to bring men to an outward profeſſion of ſaving faith, is larger then election, and makes men ſuch whom we are bound to baptize.* 2. I ſay and do profeſſe of thoſe that have thoſe ſecret reſervations wrapt up in their breſts, and not yet from under the power of luſts, yet convinced of their duty, and acknowledging the neceſſity, that it is the mind of God that they ſhould be baptized, and have admiſſion to ordinances, in order to bring them more ſincerely and unreſervedly to God. And this being the will of God, as you ſeem to yeeld when you ſay *we are bound to baptize them*; I ſay they have right in the ſight of God to Baptiſme, and it were ill with the Church if thoſe in Auſtins caſe, that would pray, *Da caſtitatem, da temperantiam Domine, ſed non modò*, ſhould be denyed all inveſtiture in Church priviledges. Where Mr. *Baxter* ſaies, *that faith which is the condition of the promiſe is the condition in foro Dei of title to the ſeal*: And I ſay, that I judge the contrary to be undenyable; After many words which are needleſſe to repeat, we have his reaſons, with a complaint that I have given no reaſon of my denyal. To which I ſay, That which in a parentheſis without reaſon is affirmed, may without rendring any reaſon be denyed. But before I come to conſider of his reaſons, it is neceſſary that the terms be looked into, and the queſtion rightly ſtated, that there may be no miſunderſtanding. When Mr *Baxter* ſpeaks of the condition of the promiſe, I ſuppoſe he means the condition called for, in order to the attainment of the thing promiſed, the promiſe for the object of the promiſe, as it is taken, *Heb.* 11. 13. Otherwiſe the promiſe it ſelf properly taken hath no condition. There was no condition inducing God to make promiſe of Chriſt, nor to make tender of any ſuch promiſe. But he promiſes glory by Chriſt on his own terms and propoſitions. Now for the reaſons themſelves to make good that; that which is the condition of the promiſe, is the condition of title to the ſeal. The firſt is, *The ſeal is but an affix to the promiſe: therefore that which is the condition of the promiſe, is, the condition of the ſeal.* The ſeal is no affix to the thing promiſed, but it is often ſeparated from it. It is a means to convey, and a way to confirm it upon Gods tearms to thoſe that have their Intereſt in the Covenant. 2. *The uſe of the ſeal is to confirm the promiſe to*

him

him to whom it is ſealed: Therefore the condition of the promiſe is the condition of the ſeal. When it is granted that the uſe of the ſeal is to confirm the thing promiſed, it will not therefore follow that there is the ſame condition required for intereſt in the ſeal as for intereſt in the thing in promiſe. If a man will ingage under ſeal to give me one hundred pounds, provided that I will come to ſuch a place and accept it, my profeſſed willingneſſe will Intereſt me in the ſeal, my actual acceptance in the Moneys. 3. *If the promiſe and ſeal have two diſtinct conditions, then there are two diſtinct Covenants, (for from the conditions moſt commonly are contracts ſpecified; and therefore Weſenbechius and ſuch like Logical Civilians, call it the form of the contract, or ſtipulation, to be either pura, vel in diem, vel ſub conditione, and thoſe ſubconditions are ſpecified oft from their various conditions) But there is not two Covenants: Therefore.* I know not well how to reach this. Is there not one thing needful to intereſt me in a bargain, or to make me a Covenanter, and another thing to obtain the benefit accruing by ſuch conditional bargain or Covenant? 4. *Is it not againſt the nature and common uſe of ſealing that it ſhould be in order before the promiſe or Covenant? And that men ſhould firſt have right to that ſeal on one condition before they have right to the promiſe, and then have right to the promiſe after on another condition.* But ſure it is not againſt the nature of ſeals to be before the mercy covenanted for, and promiſed. And I beſeech you take this into ſerious conſideration, and do not ſleightly paſſe it. Juſtifying faith with you is the Covenant, and do not you preach to work men up to it? and I hope your labours are happily ſucceſſful. Yet all of theſe to whom you preach (perhaps not a man excepted) hath this ſeal, and is baptized. Do you now in all your Miniſterial labours go againſt the nature and common uſe of ſealing? To keep a due order we muſt then forbear baptizing, not onely till men profeſſe to believe, but are actually in the faith, in a way that juſtifies. 5. *If it be ſo undenyable that that faith which is the condition of the promiſe, is not the condition in foro Dei of title to the ſeal, as you affirm, why then do ye build ſo much againſt Mr.* Tombs, *on that Argument from* Acts 2. *The promiſe is to you and your Children, arguing a right to the ſeal from an intereſt in the promiſe?* I Argue not from an intereſt in the ſeal to an intereſt in the thing promiſed, but require ſomething further. By this it appears that you take the promiſe properly, and not for the thing promiſed,

promiſed, and then I pray you reconcile this to your ſecond reaſon; The uſe of a ſeal is not to confirm in this that I have a promiſe, but that I ſhall have intereſt in the good that is promiſed. 6. *Where you ſay that an acknowledgement of the neceſſity of ſuch faith with ingagement to it is ſufficient for a title to the ſeal, I reply then thoſe that at preſent renounce Chriſt ſo it be againſt their knowledge, and conſcience, and will ingage to own him ſincerely for the future, have a title to Baptiſme.* How comes I pray you that [future] in? you manifeſt much reading in the Law, and I have heard this as a Maxime, *In obligationibus ubi nullus certus ſtatuitur dies, quovis die debetur,* There is no day overtaken but the ingagement is for preſent; though God in mercy except when for a long time the ingagement hath been preſumptuouſly neglected. But bring me a man that in his heart is convinced that Jeſus is the Chriſt, with his mouth profeſſes him, and ingages for him, and in the mean ſpace actually renounceth him, and I will do what you would have me with him; That is, a man that is falling headlong down a ladder, at the ſame inſtant he is climbing up it. When I bring this ſimilitude for illuſtration of the point in hand, that a promiſed ſervice and fidelity in war is enough to get liſted, and to do ſervice is of neceſſity to be rewarded, I am told *that this runs upon the great miſtake which I have been ſo often told of, and am further informed that the formal reaſon and denomination of a condition is from the donors conſtitution, or impoſition, giving this benefit onely on the terms by him aſſigned, and not upon our promiſe to perform them.* If I have been told of it often, it is well if I can be convinced of it now. I utterly deny that the denomination of conditions of a Covenant in actual being, is from the one, and not from the other, that is, excluſively to the other. I well know the donour is to preſcribe, and the receiver is to accept without putting in Exceptions But if there be no acceptance of terms, there is no Covenant; and there being no Covenant, there can be no Covenant conditions, as is plain by the uſual definition of Covenants; where the Goſpel is preached, and no entertainment at all given, there is no Covenant people of God, they ſtand bound by Law precepts, but are under no obligations to Covenant conditions.

Argument 4. reviewed.

The next Argument in which I am concerned, and the laſt which in this thing is produced, is, *That the Eunuch muſt firſt believe, and then be baptized; upon his deſire of Baptiſme,* Philip *ſaith, If thou believeſt with all thy heart, thou maieſt.* This I have confeſt carries more colour then all the former; and indeed I never met with any thing, either in Scripture, or reaſon produced, that carries with me ſo much as any colour for it, this excepted. Yet this is not unanſwerable. One difficult text does not uſe to take us off our hold of many plain ones. I anſwer, 1. *Philip* may call for that *de bene eſſe*, when the Eunuch was to be admitted, which was not yet eſſential to his admittance. Thoſe that preach preparatory Sermons for the Lords Supper, call for all that may give the higheſt comforts, and not barely for that which is the *Minimum quod ſic*, to give admiſſion. 2. As I have ſaid, ſo I ſay ſtill, that dogmatical faith is a true faith, and to prevent needleſſe Criticiſms, it is truly a divine faith, ſo that none can ſay that Jeſus is the Chriſt (can believingly ſubſcribe that Article) but by the holy Ghoſt, 1 *Cor.*12.3. And whoſoever ſayes with aſſent of judgment and underſtanding, that Jeſus the Son of *Mary* is Chriſt, the Son of the living God, ſpeaks more then fleſh and blood can ſuggeſt, and is not attainable but by Divine revelation. And whereas it is objected, *that it is a falſe faith, when it pretends to be that which Scripture calls faith in Chriſt, and denominateth believors*; I anſwer, 1. I have ſhewed before, that our profeſſion qualifying for Baptiſme, is not a profeſſion that we have ſuch faith, (which cannot be done without an eminence of faith to aſſurance) but a profeſſion of the neceſſity of it to ſalvation, and an engagement to it. 2. It denominates believers in the ordinary and common language of Scriptures, and whereſoever believer is put in oppoſition to unbeliever or infidel, faith of this nature is ſtill underſtood. In that famous text, 1 *Cor.*7.14. every man and woman is a believer, that was removed from heatheniſh Idolatry to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, or (as *Paulinus*, whom *Jerom* ſo much magnifies, ſpeaks) was *a baptized perſon*. Otherwiſe the caſe there put about the validity of marriage, and lawfulneſs of marriage ſociety were not between an infidel and a profeſſour of Chriſtianity, but between

a

a regenerate man whom this language onely makes a believer, and one unregenerate, which in this language are infidels, which were a caſe never yet put to queſtion. When mention is made through the Hiſtory of the *Acts* of ſo many thouſands that upon the Apoſtles preaching believed, it can denote no more then the embracing of the way of Chriſtianity, in oppoſition to Judaiſme or Heatheniſme. If it imply a through Regeneration of the ſoul, there could be no unregenerate ones among them, which is wholly againſt the nature of viſible Churches, and all experience, as hath been abundantly manifeſted. As for that diſtinction (which ſeems to be hinted) between believing Chriſt, and believing in Chriſt, Mr. *Ball* in his Treatiſe of Faith, pag. 5. hath ſufficiently ſhewed the groundleſneſſe of it, pointing out Scriptures where a prepoſition is added to the word believe, when nothing but aſſent of mind is ſignified; And where it is put without a prepoſition, when truſt and confidence is implyed. *Abraham believed God*, Rom. 4. 3. (where no prepoſition is added) *and it was counted to him for righteouſneſſe.* And on the contrary the Rulers believed εἰς, *in* or *on Chriſt*, *and loved the praiſe of men more then the praiſe of God*, Joh. 12. 42, 43. It followes, *I think if a man ſay, This is the Son, the Heir, Come let us kill him, and the inheritance ſhall be ours, we will not have this man reign over us, that theſe are not true believers, nor have right to Baptiſme, though their belief that he was the heir be a dogmaticall faith true in its kind.* I am ſorry that ſuch things ſhould be mentioned, where inquiry after truth is *contended*, and contention not ſtudied. It is well known, that I ſpeak to a faith of profeſſion, which is theirs that take to that party which is for Chriſt, and not with thoſe that profeſſedly go in a full oppoſition againſt him, and are in a high rode (any ſuch conviction of ſpirit ſuppoſed) of ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt. I know not why Dr. *Ames* ſhould be brought in, telling us, that *in thoſe places where ſaving faith is ſpoke to, truſt in the Meſſiah is ever included*: ſeeing we are ſpeaking of a faith that is ſhort of ſaving, nor yet that I ſhould be told that words of knowledge and aſſent do in Scripture oft imply affection and conſent, unleſſe that it be to let me know that it doth not generally hold; which in caſe I were in a ſtrait, and at want for a preſent anſwer, would well help me out. And whereas I am demanded, whether I do not know how ordinarily ſaving faith it ſelf is denominated from the Intellectual act alone? I anſwer, that I do know it, and if I were ignorant of it before, Mr. *Burgeſſe*

geſſe hath taught me the ſame thing, with the ſame reaſon of it in his Spiritual Refining, page 170, 171. Poſ. 8. And I know alſo, that it hath its denomination often from the act of the will alone; But will it follow that the underſtanding is never fully perſwaded for aſſent, but the will is alſo (not alone ſomewhat moved, but) throughly inclined for conſent and acceptance. If the underſtanding at any time be brought to a reall aſſent whileſt the will is ſwayed by luſts and takes to other objects, that is to me ſufficient. Or will it follow that either the *Eunuch* did or muſt neceſſarily be preſumed to underſtand, upon that little acquaintance that it ſeems he yet had in the Goſpel, the whole of thoſe choyce obſervations? or can it be any way certainly collected, that ſuch a Confeſſion that he made was accompanied with a preſent ſaving work? But Mr. *Baxter* hath ſingularly engaged me to him, quoting thoſe Texts, *John* 11. 25, 26, 27. *John* 1. 49, 50. 1 *Joh.* 4. 15. he addes, *Here is more then right to Baptiſme.* Then a man may have right to Baptiſme that is ſhort of thoſe great priviledges of dwelling in God, and being born of God; and I ſcarce know what to ſay more for my own opinion. It further followes, *If you think (as you ſeem by your anſwer to do) that a man may aſſent to the truth of the Goſpel with all his heart, and yet be void of juſtifying faith, you do not lightly erre.* It followes not (I think) from any thing that I have ſaid, that I am in any ſuch opinion. That Expreſſion is in *Philips* words, and I have told you he might require *de bene eſſe*, that which is not neceſſary to the *eſſe* of Baptiſme. But in caſe I be in any ſo heavy an Error, I am thus holpen out of it. *Though an unregenerate man may believe as many truths as the regenerate, yet not with all his heart*; Chriſt ſaith, *Matth.* 13. *The Word hath not rooting in him.* It is then granted, that he may believe all truths, and that which is added to prove that he cannot believe them with his whole heart, is not with me convincing. *The Word had not root*: not becauſe they did not intirely from the heart aſſent to it; But becauſe they received it not in the love of it. They received the light to inform their judgments, not any thorow heat for the warmth of their affections. There followes, *Doubtleſſe whether or no the practical underſtanding do unavoidably determine the will, yet God doth not ſanctifie the underſtanding truly, and leave the will unſanctified*: which muſt be ſaid, if the dogmatical faith that is the Intellectual aſſent of a wicked man, be

as

as ſtrong as that of a true believer. Here is ſuggeſted that I ſay, that the Intellectual aſſent of a wicked man is as ſtrong as that of a true believer. I know not where I have ſaid it, or any thing that implies it. It may be a true aſſent, though not of that ſtrength. But if I had ſaid it, will it thence follow, that God doth ſanctifie the underſtanding truly, and leave the will unſanctified? I trow not. Is every ſtrong Intellectual aſſent ſanctified? is every Intellectual aſſent which is of equal ſtrength with that in the regenerate truly ſanctified? Clearneſſe of light commands aſſent to truths, when corruption of affections will not ſuffer that at leaſt *pro hic & nunc*, that the goodneſſe or beſtneſſe (if I may ſo ſay) ſhould be believed. I believe it is as ſtrong in the Devils as in any Regenerate man in the world. I know not how it fares with ſome whom God may exerciſe more gently reſpective to temptations and Satans Buffettings, I am ſure that there are thoſe that would ſometimes freely give up all that is dear to them in the world, to be as clear in ſome fundamental truths as Satan himſelf; he doubtleſſe injects Scruples where himſelf is without ſcruple. I know ſome queſtion whether there be any ſuch thing as faith in divels, notwithſtanding *James* ſaith, *The Devils believe and tremble.* But certain it is, there is an Intellectual aſſent to Divine truth in the Devils, as we may ſee, *Matth.* 8. 29. *Mark* 3. 11. *Luk.* 4. 41. *Acts* 19. 15. and yet there is no ſanctification wrought. And therefore though the wicked match the regenerate in aſſent in their underſtanding, it will not follow that their underſtandings therefore are truly ſanctified. I am further referr'd to Dr. *Downam* againſt Mr. *Pemble*, which is not in my hands, and whether my anſwer be equal to ſilence, as is in the cloſe affirmed, I muſt leave to the Reader to determine.

Advertiſements given to Mr. Baxter, *touching his undertaking for Mr.* Firmin.

IN a diſtinct Section Mr. *Baxter* lets us know, how good a mind he had to have appeared in this cauſe for Mr. *Firmin*, which wonderful change in him, may well be my admiration: All know that have looked into my Birth-priviledge, that I delivered the ſame things there, as, in my Treatiſe of the Covenant, I have aſſerted againſt Mr. *Firmin*; and that paſt with Mr. *Baxter* (if reports have not deceived me) with good approbation. I communicated to him a conſiderable part of my defence of it, againſt Mr. *T.* his letter in Manuſcripts, and I bluſh not to tell the Reader that he applauded it. And beſides what I have produced already out of him, I have a witneſſe of reverend eſteem; that he hath ſaid that I had given him in diſcourſe full ſatisfaction, of the title of unregenerate men (or ſome phraſe parallell) to Sacraments. But in caſe upon change of judgment, he will appear for Mr. *Firmin* in this particular, and *that meerly* (as he ſayes) *in love of the truth, leaſt the reputation of man ſhould cloud it; and in love to the Church, and the luſtre of the Chriſtian name, leſt this fearful gap ſhould let in that pollution that may make Chriſtianity ſeem no better then the other Religions of the world.* Further explaining himſelf, *For I fear, this looſe doctrine* (ſo he is pleaſed to call it) *of Baptiſme will do more to the pollution of the Church, then others looſe doctrine of the Lords Supper, or as much.* If upon theſe ſpecious pretences he hath ſtill a mind to it, I ſhall crave leave to offer ſome words by way of advice to him.

Firſt, To reconcile himſelf to Mr. *F.* they being as yet ſo far from agreement, either in judgment or in practice; both of them are gone out of the road of the Reformed Churches, but Mr. *Baxters* friend (for whom he is about to undertake) as to his judgment is yet in the lower form, when he is in the upper. Mr. *F.* requires not truth of grace to make a viſible Church-member, but declares himſelf very largely againſt it; he requires not truth of grace in a parent to entitle his child in the right of Baptiſme. It is enough with him that he be a man of knowledge, and free from ſcandal, which he well knowes to be the caſe of many in unregeneration. And though Mr. *Baxter* is thus gone beyond

beyond him in judgment, yet he ſits down far ſhort of him in practice, and ſayes that we are bound to baptize all thoſe that make an outward profeſſion, and conſequently their children; when Mr. *F.* upon tender, conſcienciouſly refuſes many of them. Mr. *F.* and I are, as I ſuppoſe, upon neerer terms of accord, then Mr. *F.* and Mr. *Baxter*, both of us agreeing that unregenerate men have their title, and a faith that is ſhort of juſtifying may give intereſt.

Secondly, To reconcile Mr. *Firmin* to himſelf, Mr. *Baxter* much honours him (as alſo many others) for his book againſt the ſeparation, and he tells reverend Mr. *Cawdrey* (who hath wrote againſt him in this ſubject) that poſſibly he may make uſe of his book about the ſeparation againſt him; and Mr. *Cawdrey* hath in readineſſe (as I am informed from his own mouth) not a few contradictions to charge upon him, and this I can tell both Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *F.* that the beſt friends that I ever met with of them both, confeſſe, that he is a far other man in theſe writings then when he wrote againſt the ſeparation.

Thirdly, To help him out of the principles of Anabaptiſme into which he is alſo obſerved by his friends to be fallen, in making the intereſt of the ſeed in Covenant-title, to be peculiar to the Jewiſh Nation.

Fourthly, to take further care to ſhut the door againſt a new flood of Anabaptiſme, which (as I have ſhewed) himſelf hath ſet wide open; If unregenerate perſons be void of all right to Baptiſme, then their Baptiſme is null, and upon regeneration are to be baptized.

Fifthly, To conſider with himſelf how he will anſwer the breach he makes in the Church of Chriſt, having the whole face and practice (as *Apollonius* ſpeaks) of reformed Churches againſt him. That Black ink which he caſts, not onely on me, and reverend Mr. *Cawdrey*, (who have appeared in this cauſe againſt Mr. *Firmin*) but on the face of ſo many Churches ſo glorious, is unworthy of his pen; what man of name in all the reformed Churches that is not guilty of this fearful pollution as he is pleaſed to call it? *Ameſius* is a man not to be ſuſpected here of partiality, (in ſome things departing from the way of diſcipline of thoſe Churches where he lived,) yet he tells the world, *That it is falſe that they require inward vertues to make a man a viſible Church-member*; in which he is Mr. *Baxters* adverſary: and what

what liberty he allowes (which Mr. *F.* denyes) for the Baptiſme of the Infants of wicked Parents, of Infants of illegitimate birth, of Infants of excommunicate perſons, let him be conſulted, Caſes of Conſcience, *lib.* 5. *Cap.* 27. *Wallæus* excluding from Baptiſme the Infants of ſuch Parents that profeſſe they will bring them up in impiety, hereſie, and idolatry, *But out of this caſe* (ſaith he) *we judge that Baptiſme belongs to all thoſe Infants which are born of a Chriſtian race, if they be tendred to baptiſme, according to the Churches cuſtome, although their immediate Parents remain lewd in converſation, or lye under hereſie, or the crime of idolatry againſt the ſecond Commandment; for Idolatry againſt the firſt Commandment is rather apoſtaſie*: fortifying it with ſeveral arguments, the firſt of which is, *The manifeſt practice of the Church of Iſrael in the adminiſtration of Circumciſion.*

Extra vero hunc caſum judicamus omnibus illis infantibus competere Baptiſmum qui ex ſtirpe Chriſtiani nati ſunt, ſi ſecundum ordinem conſuetum Eccleſiæ ad Baptiſmum offerantur, etſi proximi eorum parentes vel vitæ improbitate, vel hæreſi laborant, vel idololatriæ crimine adverſus ſecundam tabulam; nam idololatria adverſus primam tabulam potius apoſtaſia eſt. En praxis manifeſta & perpetua totius Eccleſiæ Iſraeliticæ in adminiſtratione Circumciſionis.

The Profeſſors of *Leyden* in their *Synopſis* of more pure Divinity, are as far guilty of this ſuppoſed pollution as any, Diſput. 44. Sect. 50. *Neither* (ſay they) *do we exclude thoſe Infants from participation of this Sacrament, who are born of Parents of a Chriſtian race, and baptized, although their parents by their wicked life, or impure faith, render the efficacy of the Covenant ſealed in Baptiſme as utterly void to them, if they be offered by thoſe parents or other kindred under whoſe power they are according to the order accuſtomed in our Churches, becauſe under the New Covenant the ſon doth not bear the iniquity of the father, and God nevertheleſſe remains the God of ſuch children, as he himſelf witneſſeth,* Ezek. 16. 20. *where he calls the children of thoſe wicked Iſraelites his ſons, which they had brought forth unto God, although they had offered them to Moloch, whereupon he commanded*

Nec tamen excludimus ab hujus Sacramenti communione Infantes eos, qui ex Chriſtiana ſtirpe & baptizatis parentibus nati ſunt, etſi ipſorum parentes per vitam improbam, aut fidem impuram fœderis in baptiſmo obſignati efficaciam adverſus ſe irritam reddant; ſi ab iiſdem parentibus aut eorum propinquis, ſub quorum poteſtate ſunt juxta ordinem in Eccleſiis noſtris conſuetum baptiſmo offeruntur; quia ſub novo fœdere filius non fert iniquitatem patris, & Deus nihilominus manet ejuſmodi liberorum Deus, quemadmodum ipſe teſtatur, Ezek. 16. 20. Ubi impiorum Iſraelitarum liberos filios ſuos vocat, quos Deo genuerant, etſi eos Molocho offerrent; Unde & ejuſmodi Iſraelitarum, quorum multi in impietate ſua fuerant mortui, non minus quam piorum liberos circumcidi juſſit, Joſh. 5. 4, & 6. quod etiam Eccleſia Iſraelitica & Chriſtiana Primitiva faciendum eſſe extra controverſiam ſemper habuit.

manded the children of thoſe Iſraelites whereof many of them dyed in their ſin in the wilderneſſe, as well as the children of the godly to be circumciſed, Joſh. 5. 4,6. *which alſo the Church of Iſrael and the Chriſtian Primitive Church never queſtioned.* Mr. *Baxter* ſayes he will conſult Dr. *Drake*, to find who they be, that thoſe of his judgment admit to the Lords Supper, and I would have him withall at the ſame time to enquire whether he do not profeſſe that it is their practice to baptize promiſcuouſly? which is directly againſt Mr. *Firmins* way; and let him read Mr. *Goodwins* Evangelical Communicant; and how high ſoever he goes to keep many from the Lords Table, yet he is as large as either Mr. *Cawdrey* or my ſelf, in admiſſion to baptiſme; let him look upon the practice I may ſay almoſt univerſal in the Nation, and ſee what courſe they generally hold, and I have not heard that they have yet learnt to diſtinguiſh between the Infants right, and the Churches obligation; that the Infants of ſuch or ſuch Parents are without any right, and yet the Church ſtands bound to give them admiſſion. Mr. *Firmin* doth ſufficiently declare how ſenſible he is of his diſſent from his brethren, let Mr. *Baxter* then undertaking for him, ſee how wide a breach he is like to make inſtead of union. If that complement therefore which is caſt upon me by Mr. *Baxter*, *Si pace tanti viri dixerim*, had been *tantorum virorum*, and had ſpoken out who thoſe be that he ſo heavily charges as before, to obſcure the Church, and the luſtre of the Chriſtian name, &c. and plainly told us that it is the generality of all that go under the name of Churches reformed, the ſpeech does not now appear ſo modeſt, but then it would have been as arrogant.

Sixthly, That he make ſome proviſion for tender and ſcrupulous conſciences that ſhall admit his principles, 1. In taking in of members into Church-fellowſhip, as it is called. A man without grace in a viſible Church according to him is as a wooden leg in the body; how great a deformity this is, and how great a trouble to have ſuch inſtead of thoſe that are of fleſh and bone, it is eaſy to judge, and yet how many of theſe neceſſarily will and muſt be received? 2. In baptiſme of Infants. To baptize an Infant is with him, not onely to eſpouſe, but to ſolemnize a full and actual marriage with Chriſt Jeſus, and that in words not *de futuro*, but *de præſenti*, and what further glory then they may expect from his hand I ſcarce can tell. An illuſtrious Prince will

have

have none but of noble and Royal blood, and Chriſt will have none to be thus, in marriage relation given to him but the ſeed of regenerate, and graciouſly qualified perſons. How ſhall I get intelligence that this or that infant is deſcended of ſuch a race? where ſhall I learn his or her pedigree, that I may thus give to Chriſt Ieſus? And in caſe probabilities muſt lead us, we have need of further help then yet we ſee, to judge of ſuch probability. Muſt we find thoſe qualifications in the man, who himſelf is for Baptiſme or his child, that may move us to conclude that in all reaſon and poſſible apparance here is a child of God, or an Infant of a regenerate perſon? Or will it ſerve our turn, and ſatisfie our conſciences, that we cannot certainly conclude the contrary? If the firſt be required, it will put all the Miniſters of Chriſt hard to it, and prove ſuch a ſnare that I know not how they will extricate themſelves; If the latter be that which we muſt receive, here is then a looſe rule for to lead in ſo high proceedings. For men will be ſo laxe in their own marriage choice, as for to take any into that ſociety, if they be not able to conclude her a ſtrumpet or deſperately wicked; we have hitherto believed that Jeſus Chriſt is pleaſed to receive in a greater latitude into viſible relation.

Seventhly, I deſire Mr. *Baxter* to tell us how he hath mended the matter, and provided for the honour and luſtre of the Chriſtian name, or made up at all that gappe of which he ſpeaks. He ſaies the Church is bound to baptize as largely, as I ſay men have right to Baptiſme. I think here he will find little or no difference; and when he refuſes none that I receive, and where I ſay they have right, he ſaies, we are bound to baptize without right; how will this make Chriſtianity to look with any better face? how much will *Worceſterſhire* Congregations, where this is received, exceed other Congregations, where unanimouſly it is denyed? I would have him to reflect on his 18th. Argument, and ſee whether the force of it be not evidently as much againſt hinſelf as it is againſt me, againſt whom it is brought. It is thus framed; That doctrine which makes it the regular way in Baptiſme, for all men to promiſe that which they can neither ſincerely promiſe nor perform, is unſound. But ſuch is Mr. *Blakes*: Ergo. And after much work to explain himſelf, it comes to this, that unregenerate men cannot reſolve or ſincerely promiſe to love, believe or obey, and therefore upon that account are without right to baptiſme. Let it be

be taken into conſideration, that when I ſay theſe men that in their preſent ſtate are thus unable to love, believe, and obey, have notwithſtanding right to Baptiſme, and he ſaies that this inability notwithſtanding, they ought to be baptized, how is the matter mended? If my Doctrine upon this account be unſound, his doctrine and practice will be found unſound likwiſe. Mr. *Baxter* ſaith, *Vocation which is effectual onely to bring men to an outward profeſſion of faith, is larger then election, and makes men ſuch whom we are bound to baptize.*

Eighthly, I ſhall deſire ſome Scripture text or cogent reaſon to make it appear that we are bound to baptize thoſe that in the ſight of God have no right to Baptiſme, the command given will argue with me their right, unleſſe I hear an injunction from heaven that notwithſtanding their want of right we are to baptize them. *Peter* argues the right of thoſe, *Acts* 10. 47. for their admiſſion to Baptiſme, which had been more then needed, in caſe without any ſuch right the water in Baptiſme might have been applied unto them; and I marvel that Mr. *Baxter* ſhould ſo tenaciouſly hold to *Philips* ſpeech to the *Eunuch*, If thou believeſt with all thy heart, thou mayeſt; ſeeing he believes as well as I that faith ſhort of this which he ſaies theſe words neceſſarily imply, might have admitted him, and put a neceſſity on *Philip* to have baptized him, though it would not have given him right to Baptiſme. His actual admiſſion, and not his right, is there put to the queſtion. If theſe things be well conſidered, Mr. *Baxter* may ſee cauſe to begin with a confutation of Mr. *F.* before he undertakes a defence; and I ſuppoſe the Reader will ſee that he had ſmall cauſe to cenſure my Arguments to be ſo dilute unleſſe he himſelf had brought ſome of greater ſtrength.

Laſtly, I would have Mr. *Baxter* ſeriouſly conſider, whether that which we have obſerved already out of him, and might yet further be gathered, may not make up a forcible Argument, and concluſive of this title to Baptiſme, in thoſe who yet riſe not up to the Faith that is juſtifying, when they are ſeparate from Paganiſme into fellowſhip with the viſible Church, as he aſſerts, *Saints Reſt*, Part 4. Sect. 3. pag. 105. and with them their iſſue, as he hath concluded from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. when they attain to graces real, and true, as we have ſeen from him; I am ſure the Apoſtle, as hath been ſaid, *Act.* 10. 47. argues from ſuch qualifica-

tions, to an intereſt in Baptiſme; when they have their intereſt in the Covenant of grace, as a fruit of Chriſts death, as he ſaith, doubtleſſe reprobates have, Treatiſe of Infant-Baptiſme, pag. 224. when their Baptiſme hath all that is eſſential to Gods ſealing, as he aſſerts it hath, pag. 222. All of this laid together, with more that may be taken up, will in all indifferent Readers eyes conclude a title: And further, whether he have not ſpoken as much in plain words, *terminis terminantibus* for the intereſt of unregenerate men, or men of a meer viſible profeſſion in Baptiſme, let his words be conſidered, Saints Reſt, Part 4. Sect. 3. pag. 104, 105. Where giving holy, and ſeaſonable advice to beware the company of ſenſual, and ungodly men, he limits it with Cautions, leaſt it ſhould be thought, that he perſwades, as he rightly ſtiles it, unto an ungodly ſeparation, he addes, *As I never found one word in Scripture, where either Chriſt or his Apoſtles denyed admittance to any man that deſired to be a member of the Church, though but onely profeſſing to repent and believe; ſo neither did I ever there find that any but convicted Hereticks, or ſcandalous ones (and that for the moſt part after due admonition) were to be avoided, or debarred our fellowſhip. And whereas it is urged, that they are to prove their intereſt to the priviledges that they lay claim to, and not we to deſprove it; I anſwer, If that were granted, yet their meer ſober profeſſing to Repent and believe in Chriſt, is a ſufficient evidence of their intereſt to Church-membership, and admittance thereto by Baptiſme (ſuppoſing them not admitted before:) and their being baptized perſons, (if at age) or members of the univerſal viſible Church, (into which it is that they are baptized) is ſufficient evidence of their intereſt to the Supper, till they do by hereſie, or ſcandall blot that evidence; which evidence if they do produce, yea, though they are yet weak in the faith of Chriſt, who is he that dare refuſe to receive them? And, this after much doubting, diſpute, and ſtudy of the Scriptures, I ſpeak as confidently, as almoſt any truth of equall moment; ſo plain is the Scripture in this point, to a man that brings his underſtanding to the model of Scripture, and doth not bring a model in his brain, and reduce all he reads to that model.* What have I ſpoke more then here is ſaid? and did I ever ſpeak with more and higher confidence? I ſay, that a faith which is ſhort of juſtifying gives title to Baptiſme; and he ſayes, Such give ſufficient evidence of their intereſt to Church-membership, and

conſe-

conſequently admittance to Baptiſme; ſo that if my doctrine herein be looſe, (as he chargeth it) the Reader will hardly find his to be faſt; and it heares not well, to play faſt and looſe. The evaſion of equivocal will not here ſerve, that will utterly ſpoyl the whole ſtrength of his Caution, and put men amain on this ſeparation, as it will contradict his aſſertion, of their grace as real, and true: They will ſay, They will have no fellowſhip with *a dead Corps*, inſtead of *a reall man*; for that is his expreſſion of the difference between what is real, and what is equivocal. Neither can he here come off by the help of his diſtinction of *forum Dei*, and *forum Eccleſiæ*. Theſe gifts and graces from God, theſe priviledges vouchſafed of God, and purchaſed by Chriſt, plainly enough ſpeak a right in the ſight of God. Neither is there (as we have heard) in this Controverſie any ſuch diſtinction to be admitted. I am therefore in this no further to blame, then he hath been; and if he ſee cauſe to recede from, yet I ſee all reaſon to perſiſt in my opinion.

SECT. X.

Propoſition. 8.

For the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, there cannot be that vaſt difference and diſproportion between it and baptiſme, that the one ſhould be a priviledge of the Church viſible, and the other peculiar and proper to the Church inviſible: that all in the outward adminiſtration of the Covenant (as ſome ſpeak) ſhould be intereſſed in the one, and onely thoſe that come up to the termes of the Covenant ſhould have any intereſt in the other. Chriſt gave order that *Diſciples ſhould be baptized*, Matth. 28. 19. and he delivered his *Supper to Diſciples*, Matth. 26. 26, 27. and it is more then ſtrange that diſciples ſhould be taken in that æquivocall way, as to hold out all in outward profeſſion, confœderation. and viſible Church communion, in the one, (as is almoſt generally agreed upon between Pædobaptiſts and their adverſaries) and to be reſtrayned to thoſe that anſwer to their profeſſion in the other; ſo that in the adminiſtration of the one, the diſpenſers have a firme rule to lead them, *viz.* viſibility of intereſt (as Mr. *Cobbet* hath largely ſhewn in his Vindication, pag. 52. Cou. 4.) and in the other can have

No ſuch vaſt difference between baptiſme and the Lords Supper: that the one ſhould be a priviledge of the Church viſible, and the other peculiar, to the Church inviſible.

have nothing for their guide, but an inviſible work, left to their charity to conjecture. *Diſciple* therefore reſpective to either of the Sacraments (which are outward viſible ordinances and viſible Church priviledges) can be no more then a man of viſible intereſt. When Chriſt ſate down to the Paſſeover, it is ſaid *he ſate down with the twelve*, onely they had right to eat of it in his company, *Exod.* 12. 3. being of his family; And, *as he was eating he gave the Supper*, but then the phraſe is changed, *he gave it to his Diſciples*, onely the twelve were occaſionally there, but it was inſtituted in behalf of all Diſciples, of which the number could not be ſmall; conſidering how many *John* had made and baptized, and Chriſt had made and baptized more then he, though not in perſon, but by his Diſciples, *Joh.* 4. 1, 2. A reverend brother makes this practice of Chriſt at the firſt inſtitution and adminiſtration of the Supper, to be a directory for future, to receive ſuch onely to it, as are the Diſciples of Chriſt. To which I willingly condeſcend, provided that the word be aright underſtood. I know the word is ſometimes taken in a reſtrayned ſenſe, for thoſe that indeed do the duty of diſciples, *Joh.* 8. 31. *If ye continue in my word, then are ye my Diſciples indeed*; and, *Luke* 14. 33. *Whoſoever he be of you that forſaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my Diſciple.* As the word *Iſraelite* is ſometimes taken for thoſe that do the duty of Iſraelites, and are ſuch as Iſraelites ought to be, *Joh.* 1. 47. *Behold, an Iſraelite indeed, in whom there is no guile*; when reſpective to fruition of Church ordinances (of what nature ſoever) all that were of *Iſrael* according to the fleſh or viſible Church-Members in *Iſrael*, are expreſſed by it. *Diſciple*, or *Iſraelite*, is a man of outward Covenant intereſt. The latitude of it, according to Scripture expreſſions, I have ſhewen, Treatiſe of the Covenant, pag. 208. All that were Chriſts family Diſciples, did eat of the Paſſeover with him, *Matth.* 26. 18. even *Judas*, as is acknowledged, and ſcarce to be doubted of but he did eat of the Supper. It is more then ſtrange, that as a Diſciple he ſhould be taken into the Paſſeover, and a few houres after, as no Diſciple ſhould be put from the Supper. The Lords Supper is for the building of thoſe that Baptiſme takes in; But Baptiſme takes into the Church viſible. Viſible Church members have then intereſt in the Supper. When Sacraments are in their uſe diſtinguiſhed, one for admittance into the Church, and the other for growth; one as the Sacrament of our birth,

and

and the other our nouriſhment, moſt underſtand the firſt of admiſſion into the Church viſible (well knowing that regeneration is not tyed to baptiſme,) but the growth many will have to be in the Church inviſible, which inharmonious diſcord between Ordinances of the ſame kind cannnot be ſuffered. To give notes of the Diſciples of Chriſt, for diſcovery of a Diſciple in the former ſenſe, by their affections to him, and ſuffering of affliction for him, are of ſingular uſe: Chriſt himſelf hath gone before us in it. But upon the notation of the word, becauſe Chriſt gave the Bread and Cup to Diſciples, to make the ſubject of that Sacrament to be onely thoſe that reach theſe markes, is beſides the holy Ghoſts intention. All outward Ordinances are for the Church *in fieri*, and not onely *in facto*, for the bringing of it on to Chriſt. I ſhould deſire to know where any outward ſenſible Ordinance is made, or how in reaſon, and according to Scripture, it can be made the proper peculiar right of inviſible members.

SECT. XI.

Propoſition. 9.

The Lords Supper is not limited to thoſe that have received a new life by the Spirit.

THe Sacrament of the Supper (no more then other Ordinances) is not limited to thoſe that have received a new life in Chriſt by the Spirit, that are actually regenerate, and in grace; others as they may be admitted without ſin, ſo they are in a capacity and poſſibility, to receive benefit from it. This I am not ignorant that ſome will queſtion: But let theſe conſider before they cenſure.

Arguments.

Firſt, That it is an external Ordinance as hath been ſaid, a priviledge of the Church as viſible, put into the hands of thoſe for edification, that are not able to diſcern men of ſpiritual life, and inviſible intereſt. And though there be characteriſticall differnces, whereby a man in grace, and he that is ſhort of it, may be diſtinguiſhed; whereby all bad ground at the beſt may be differenced from that which is good: yet they are ſuch, whereby a man is to make trial of himſelf, onely they are Spirit-works; and none knowes them in any man ſave the Spirit that

is in him, and therefore no marks for any others cognizance. For a Minister of Christ to dispence by command the Sacrament to many, when he knowes that it is of possible use and benefit to some few, unto these it is food and nourishment unto life; unto the others as Rats-bane, Poyson, and onely for death; is such a snare that may hold him in his administration, in all horror and amazement. A sad *dilemma*, either to lay aside an Ordinance of Christ, and so never come up in his place to the whole of his duty; or else to deliver to them that which will inevitably be the ruine and destruction of so many of them. I know no possible way that can be supposed, or so much as pretended for avoidance; but in the Name of Christ, to give warning to all, in whom this new life by the Spirit is not, to abstain every man and woman not actually regenerate, on their peril to keep off. Let them say, some know their danger in the highest terms that can be uttered, and then if they come, their blood is on their own heads, and the Minister of Christ hath by this means delivered his soul. But to this I have three things to say, 1. That it is, (as I suppose) without all Scripture-precedent, to warn men upon account of want of a new life by the Spirit, wholly to keep off from this, or any other Ordinance of Christ. I know we must warn men of their sin, and the judgement hanging over their heads for sin (in which let it be our prayer, that we may be more faithful) but that we should warn men upon this account, upon this very ground, to hold off from all addresse to Ordinances, I have not learnt. 2. I say, this doth presuppose that which is wont to be denyed, unregenerate men to be in a capacity to examine themselves respective to this Ordinance. How can we warn them upon want of justifying faith, and the saving work of repentance, to hold back, when they are in an incapacity upon trial to find themselves thus wanting? 3. Shall we not hereby pluck the thorne out of our own sides, and as much as in us lyes, thrust it into the sides of many of our hungry, thirsty, and poor in spirit people? How many may we suppose are in grace, through a work happily begun on their souls? yet for several reasons are not able to see this grace, or reach to any discovery of it. Sometimes by reason of the infancy of the work upon their hearts, being yet babes, or rather embryo's in grace. The first that appears upon light received, is an army of lusts and potent corruptions, as we know *Paul*

sets

ſets it out. This cloudes for preſent any other weak work, that as yet in preſent is wrought. In this time Satan is not wanting, he did not ſhew ſo much artifice before to leſſen their ſin, but he now makes uſe of as much to aggravate it: and as he was induſtrious before to ſeduce, now he is as buſie to accuſe. He led the inceſtuous man to incontinency, 1 *Cor.* 7.4. And we know *Paul* feares, leaſt upon continuance of the Church-cenſure, he would gain advantage to ſwallow him up in overmuch ſorrow, 2 *Cor.* 2.8,11. Theſe perhaps as yet are not able to give an account of the nature of faith and repentance, or their genuine fruits; much leſſe are they able, by a reflex act to conclude the truth of them in their ſouls. Sometimes by reaſon of ſome ſharpe conflict of temptation, being under the ſhock and aſſault of it, and therefore whatſoever they have ſeen of grace heretofore, or the favour of God, now it is under a cloud (which I believe was *Pauls* caſe, when a meſſenger of Satan was ſent to buffet him, and a thorne in the fleſh given him,) ſeeing it is put in oppoſition to the abundance of revelations that he had being taken up into the third heavens, 2 *Cor.* 12.) and therefore had need of Ordinances for ſupport. Sometimes on a ſoyle received by temptation, of which his own heart, and not the Church is witneſſe; and therefore is at a loſſe of the joy of his ſalvation, and ſtands in need of ſtrength for recovery. Sometimes by over-much ſloath, and ruſt contracted on his graces through negligence, which is ſuppoſed to be the caſe of the ſpouſe indulging her ſelf too much in carnal eaſe, *Cant.* 5.2. *I have put off my coat, how ſhall I put it on? I have waſhed my feet, how ſhall I defile them?* Sometimes God out of prerogative, withdrawing the rayes of his Spirit, and refuſing to teſtifie with our ſpirits, in which caſe the ſoul that is moſt upright with God, and ſincere in his feare, walks in darkneſſe and ſees no light; in which there is need of all communications from God, and attendance upon him in Ordinances. When theſe ſhall hear all in whom the work of grace is not in truth, thus warned to keep back, and told of the high danger of approaching to this Table in ſuch a way aggravated, will not they put in their name, and ſay their ſouls are now ſpoke to? They muſt therefore abſent themſelves, and ſo the ſmoaking flax is quenched, and the bruiſed reed broke. There have not been a few hungry ſad ſouls that I have known, that have born the terror of the Lord, ſeparate themſelves for this reaſon. But

it

it will be replyed by thoſe that give this warning, that they mean not theſe, they are not at all intended in their ſpeech; theſe they would tender, and with all endeared affection of love encourage, as thoſe that have moſt need, and are moſt fit to receive food, for their ſtrength. But all of this helps not, when this Propoſition is laid down, That *no man in whom juſtifying faith, and a new life by the Spirit is not wrought, may dare, otherwiſe then on the peril of his ſoul*, to draw nigh hither: will not ſuch a ſoul, neceſſarily aſſume? A new life through the Spirit is not wrought in my ſoul; I am conſcious to my ſelf that I am carnal: whatſoever endeavours I have uſed to believe, yet how far am I from faith in ſtrength and truth? I find my ſelf all over doubts and fears, and plunged in unbelief. And though I have made it my buſineſſe to keep off from ſin, yet how far am I from a true change by repentance? I find my heart hard, obdurate, even as an adamant; yea, the poor deſerted ſoul will take to it ſelf the ſtate of *Cain*, the condition of *Judas*: If there be any other high in wickedneſſe, they have matched, yea, they have exceeded them. They are to put it to the queſtion, whether they are in grace or no? whether they have a new life wrought, or as yet are ſhort of it? This they muſt either determine in the affirmative, that they are in grace, at leaſt there are thoſe hopeful ſigns in preſent, that they cannot but conclude it, and then they ſafely may come, upon ſight of this they may with cheerfulneſſe make their addreſſe; or elſe they muſt carrie it in the negative, all that is yet wrought is not life, is not grace, is not faith in its power, is not repentance in truth, as they can do no other *that walk in darkneſſe, and ſee no light*; that ſay, *God hath forgotten to be gracious*, and ſo they muſt keep off from the Ordinance, and debar themſelves from thoſe cordials, thoſe apples, thoſe flagons that are there tendered: and *ſick of love*, yet dare not intermeddle with the Lords tokens that are tendered to them: or in the third place ſuſpend, and ſo ſit down in doubtful fears, whether they have grace or no; and then that of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 14.23. *He that doubteth, is damned if he eat*, becauſe he eateth not of faith, *for whatſoever is not of faith is ſin*, will ſoon come into their thoughts, and ſo all that are ſhort of fulneſſe of aſſurance, muſt in dreadful horror ſeparate themſelves.

Secondly, This Sacrament, in that it is a Sacrament, hath the name and nature of a ſeal, (as we ſee in the text, and God willing

ſhall

ſhall be ſhewn) a viſible ſeal, intruſted in the hands of man; and therefore muſt needs be of a more different latitude and large extent, then that ſeal which God reſerves in his own keeping, the ſeal of the Spirit, The Lord knowes them that are his, 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. But man is to ſeek who are the Lords, God knowes how to put to his ſeal to his own; man who hath not this knowledg muſt needs be here allowed a greater latitude; either men entruſted with it, muſt have the knowledge of God as to this particular, who they are in whom a new life is, and grace wrought; or elſe they muſt be allowed a greater latitude to take in men that make profeſſion of God, and as members in Church-Communion may be edified by it: I know this argument is carried another way, and that we conclude the contrary upon a double account.

1. Theſe ſeales of God (outward and inward) ſhould anſwer each to other. Thoſe that have the outward ſeal, they are to have the inward; thoſe that take into their hand the ſeal of the Sacrament ſhould have the impreſſe of the Spirit on their ſoules. To which I anſwer, That the writing of the Word with Inke and Paper in the Bible, and the writing in the heart by the Spirit, ſhould anſwer each the other: that is, every Chriſtian ſhould make it his buſineſſe, to hide that Word in his heart, that by the Miniſtery ſounds in his ears: and yet Chriſtians are not warned, not to take a Bible into their hands, till the impreſſe of that which is there is put on their hearts. The Word is delivered in a greater latitude, and ſo alſo muſt the Sacrament.

2. Some ſay, this Sacrament ſeales Goſpel-promiſes, onely they therefore that can claime the promiſe, and have their intereſt in it, can claime the ſeal, otherwiſe the *ſeal is put to a blank*; there is a ſeal where there is no Covenant-promiſe. 1. I anſwer, this argument thus carried, ſpeaks ſadly to the hearts of all diſpenſers of the Sacraments: they muſt ſee there is a Covenant-promiſe, or elſe they muſt not dare to put to a ſeal. To put any mans ſeal to a blank paper where nothing is written, is a vain uſe of that ſeal; It ſtands there as a cypher: Now to put Gods ſeal to a blank where nothing is written, doubtleſſe is as vain, and an high taking of Gods Name in vain: according to theſe the Covenant is written in non-legible and inviſible characters. (This inward work is *that white ſtone with a new name written, which no*

man knoweth ſave he that receives it) Revel. 2. 17. and ſo the diſpenſers too often againſt convictions of conſcience (allwayes at hap-hazard) muſt deliver them, any thing written or not written, whether a blank or filled up, they cannot tell, but are all at uncertainties. 2. I anſwer, as is the ſeal, ſo is the Covenant, both of them external, and one muſt anſwer to the other: Now theſe in queſtion (as hath been demonſtrated at large) are in Covenant. An outward Covenant is by few queſtioned, and ſo the ſeal is put to no blank, but given to one intereſted in Covenant. It ſeals the grace of the Covenant, and mercy tendred in the promiſe on Gods termes and propoſitions. So that the different latitude of the ſeal of the Spirit, and of the ſeal of the Sacrament, do conclude that men of no more then viſible Church-intereſt may partake of it.

3. The Church *de facto* hath injoyed it in this latitude, not to inſtance in ſome ages following the times of the Apoſtles, in which the Paſtors called all their people to daily Sacraments, and the uſe of it in *Auſtins* time, when wicked ones in the Church were ſo numerous, that they durſt not deal with Church-cenſures; but look into the Scripture, though we are kept much in the dark concerning their practice, (little mention being made of the adminiſtration after the inſtitution) yet we know that this Sacrament was the priviledge of viſible members then in being, and it is clear enough, how far many, even then were ſhort of ſincerity. If that of 1 *Cor.* 11. be well weighed, we may well believe that the Primitive times were not acquainted with the rigour of ſome perſons.

4. There is no reaſon that this Ordinance ſhould ſtand alone, that in all other Ordinances there ſhould be a greater latitude, (and men in an unregenerate ſtate admitted, and not held out with limit to men, in whom a life of Sanctification through the Spirit is found) and this alone pent up in ſo narrow a compaſſe. I know ſomewhat is ſaid for the latitude of ſome Ordinances, that all are received to them, becauſe they are Ordinances appointed for converſion of men unconverted. But this Plea in many will not ſerve; unregenerate mens admiſſion to prayer, to thankſgiving, to faſts, hath been (that I know) queſtioned by few: And thoſe that deny that the Lords Supper hath any influence to converſion, have not aſſerted theſe to have any ſuch efficacy or power: unregenerate men then muſt be admitted to

the

the Supper, or elſe they muſt be denyed to come to faſts, thanks-giving and prayer. Here ſome do diſtinguiſh between duties naturally Moral, and thoſe that are of meer poſitive inſtitution. Moral duties, as prayer, thankſgiving, &c. are conſeſt to belong in general unto all, but it is not ſo (as is objected) in duties of poſitive inſtitution; they are given with limit to ſome, and are not of univerſal obligation. To which I anſwer, 1. By way of conceſſion, poſitive Precepts bind not all, becauſe they are not given to all: the Gentile Nations were not tied to the Law of Ceremonies given to the Jewes, and meer Heathens are not now tied to our Sacraments. 2. For a poſitive anſwer I ſay, Poſitive Precepts were never given in charge with any ſuch diſtinction as to bind the regenerate, and to exclude men in unregeneration. Men under ſin, and in nature, are bound to the affirmative part of the ſecond Commandement, to obſerve every way of worſhip that ſhall be inſtituted by God: all of which are onely of poſitive right. All *Iſrael* were tied to ſacrifice, as well as to hear, and pray; it was a ſin not to ſacrifice, as not to fear an oath, *Eccleſ.* 9. 2. And all Chriſtians are now under an obligation to the Law of the Sacraments, as they are to other duties. And as to the thing in hand, this diſtinction of Moral, and Poſitive duties (as I conceive) is of no uſe; for the poſitive Command being given, there is a Moral tie to yeeld obedience. Inſtance may be given in purely Ceremonial Precepts, that are ſeconded with this ſanction, *I am the Lord*, Levit. 19.23,24,25. So that when a Precept meerly Ceremonial was broke, immediately, yet the firſt Command was broken interpretatively, and by way of neceſſary conſequence, the Law of nature tied *Adam* to abſtain from the forbidden fruit, when God had given him a Precept not to eat of it; and the young man in the Goſpel was alſo bound to ſell all that he had, and give it to the poor, when Chriſt had manifeſted that it was his pleaſure. There are texts indeed produced, ſeemingly taken of men under ſin, from the performance of poſitive duties, as, *Math.* 5.23,24. and as much may be ſaid concerning thoſe that are Moral, *Ezek.* 14.2,3. 20.2,3. We read that the ſacrifices of the wicked are an abomination, *Prov.* 15.8. & 21.27. and as much is ſaid of their prayers, *Prov.* 28.9. All which texts ſuffi ciently imply Gods diſlike, when they are acted by ſuch hands; but none of them imply mans diſobligation.

Fifthly, This limit of the Lords Supper to regenerate perſons, as on the one hand it will take with the conſciences of many ſanctified Chriſtians, to hold them back, as hath been ſaid, even with all that ſtand ſhort of aſſurance of grace; ſo on the other hand it will give encouragement to many unſanctified ones, to make addreſſe to it: Broken hearts under the body of ſin having not yet attained to the light of Gods ſmiling face, will be ſo ſevere in their own cenſure, as to hold themſelves back. The generation of formal Profeſſors pure in their own eyes, and not yet cleanſed from their filthineſſe, *Prov.* 30. 11. will flock to it. So that we muſt either find ſome other more ſure rule, or elſe the hearts of many precious ones, whom God would not have made ſad, will be ſadned, and the hands of many in ſin, upon their admiſſion, will be ſtrengthned.

Objections anſwered.

I know there are Objections even without number multiplyed, againſt this that I have here delivered, and ſuch that have taken with very many, to carry them to determine the Point in hand in a contrary way: And in caſe I had not ſeen that the weakneſſe of them is more and more diſcerned, and that by men of eminent parts and integrity, I ſhould have been by the multitude as well of Objections, as Objectors, diſcouraged to appear againſt them. *The duties of the Lords Supper are ſuch,* (ſay ſome) *that onely the ſincere ſervants of Chriſt, that are ſanctified by Chriſt, are able to perform. The mercies of the Sacrament are ſuch, as they onely can receive;* and therefore onely theſe are the fit ſubjects of it. And theſe are driven on very far. *The duties preparatory to the work, cannot be done by others,* (as is objected) *as ſelf-examination, ſelf-judging. The duties executory cannot be done, that accompany the work it ſelf.* How ſpecious ſoever this argument appears, and I doubt not but it is with all ſincerity of heart and integrity urged, yet I deſire it may yet be further conſidered,

Firſt, That this Argument, thus urged, doth diſable all men not ſanctified from all other duties by the command of God incumbent upon them, as well as from this duty; they muſt upon this account exclude themſelves from every Ordinance enjoyned of God as well as from this; put the argument into form, and this will eaſily appear. They that cannot do the duties charged upon thoſe that are put upon a work, nor receive the mercies given in promiſe to it, are to be excluded from it: Now as theſe aſſume,

aſſume, An unſanctified man cannot diſcharge the duties, nor receive the comforts of a Communicant; ſo will I with equal reaſon aſſume, That an unſanctified man cannot perform the duties charged upon the hearers of the Word, upon him that calls upon the Name of God, or returns thanks to him; He cannot perform the duties that are charged puon him; that is, to ſanctifie the Sabbath, to meditate, to inſtruct his family, rebuke his brother, give almes, follow the duties of his calling. No unſanctified man does all that is required in the performance of any of theſe, neither is any fit to receive the mercies of theſe duties, that is unfit to receive the mercies of that duty; Therefore it followes that he muſt neither hear, pray, give thanks, ſanctifie the Sabbath, inſtruct or reprove any, give almes, labour in his Calling, or any other work. If any think to come off by way of diſtinction, That there is difference between this and other duties; Then the diſtinction ſhould have been put into the Propoſition, and it not delivered in that generality; and whenſoever that diſtinction ſhall be put, I ſhall not doubt but an anſwer in the diſtinction will be ſuggeſted.

Secondly, Inabilities to perform duties, upon the bare account of natural corruption, in a right way, and in that acceptable manner, as to receive the comforts of them, do not diſcharge a man from obligation to the duty: In caſe indeed it could be proved, that God never gave the Sacrament in charge to an unſanctified man, but left this viſible Ordinance, as a Legacy or charge to an inviſible Society, whom none but themſelves, can diſtinguiſh, and few of them able to diſtinguiſh themſelves then the argument were of ſome force; but from the inability to reaſon againſt obligation to the duty, to take men off from it upon that account of weakneſſe through natural corruption, will take all men off that are unregenerate from all duties.

Thirdly, Thoſe that in this way diſable all men in nature from theſe duties which are given in charge to a Communicant, upon that ground to keep them from the Sacraments, yet confeſſe they may do this work in order at leaſt to their own excluſion; they cannot examine themſelves in order to receive, but they may and muſt examine themſelves in order to hold themſelves off from it. When the Apoſtle ſpeaks to the whole viſible Church of *Corinth* expreſſely, *Let a man examine himſelf, and*

ſo

ſo let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup. This few (ſay they) can reach; but to examine, and not to eat, is in the power of all the other.

Fourthly, Though theſe reach not the higheſt duties, and ſo come not up to the ultimate end of the Sacrament, yet they perform in their meaſure ſeveral duties, and reach the intermediate and ſubordinate end of it. *They ſee Chriſt there evidently ſet forth, and crucified before them:* There they ſee the higheſt aggravation of ſin, *Chriſt wounded for ſin, bruiſed for tranſgreſſion,* under the Fathers wrath for mans guilt, ſuffering for ſin, *the juſt for the unjuſt.* They ſee him bearing the ſins of many, and they cannot nor may not exclude themſelves from the number. They ſee there a ranſome paid for ſin, a diſcharge made to the Fathers Juſtice. They ſee Chriſt tendered, and offered: They may further oblige themſelves to all duties required, as well to the intereſting grace, which is faith, as to the qualifications of obedience; They do believe, *Acts* 2.12,13. *Luke* 8.13. *Joh.*12. 42, 43. 1 *Tim.* 1.19. This faith is true in its kind, they do not onely yeeld aſſent, but reach to ſome meaſure of joy, and delight, *Luke* 8.13. They are in Chriſt, their way of inheſion or implantation I ſhall not determine; But in the latitude as he is an head, he hath members that are inherent in him, he is an head of a Church viſible, and hath many members ſuitable, as the Reader may ſee in *Cobbet* of Infant-Baptiſme, Concluſ. 5. pag. 56. Whileſt thoſe hearers mentioned, *Luke* 8.13. believed, I cannot think it was the ſeeds-mans office, who had ſounded the Word in their ears, to have withheld the viſible Word from their eyes, or adviſed them to have withdrawn themſelves. And as they do duties incumbent on Communicants, ſo alſo they receive mercies, many intermediate mercies, though in that ſtate they receive not the higheſt and choiceſt mercies. They partake of the fatneſſe of the Olive, *Rom.* 11. even all that come into that ſtate that the blinded Jewes, and the worſt part among them did relinquiſh.

SECT.

SECT. XII.

Proposition 10.

The Lords Supper must be so administred, that Communicants may be edified.

THe *Lords Supper* (*as all other Ordinances of Christ*) *must be so administred, that the Kingdom of Christ may be most advanced, and the Church in her members most edified.* Let all be done to edification, is the Apostles rule, 1 *Cor.* 14. 26. Not as an Apostolical Canon, (as Mr. *Hooker* in his Ecclesiastical Policy hath observed; for then, if the Apostle had been silent, that injunction had not been obliging) but as a necessary result from all that they had in charge from Jesus Christ; Prophecie exceeds unknown tongues, because it edifies, 1 *Cor.* 14.4. And unknown tongues are without profit, and of no use, without interpretation to edifie, ver. 5. Therefore we have the Apostles resolution for publique prayers, ver. 14, 15, 16, 17. *For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitfull: what is it then? I will pray with the Spirit, and with understanding also; I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also. Else when thou shalt blesse with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks? seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest; for thou verily givest thankes well, but the other is not edified.* And for the preaching of the Word, ver. 18, 19. *I thank my God, I speak with tongues more then you all; yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, then ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.* Matters circumstantiall, and of themselves indifferent, if they be not reduced to this end, prove inexpedient, and to the doer evil. *All things are lawful for me, but all thinges edifie not*, 1 Cor. 10. 23. The whole of the Ministerial work, and every appendant to it must be reduced hither; what have builders to do but to edifie? And if they edifie not, what do they do? In what other metaphor soever their work is set out, this is still their businesse, *the perfecting of the Saints, the edifying of the body of Christ*, Ephes. 4. 12. When they have done this, and made it their whole businesse, they may with confidence speak to God in the words of Christ, *I have glorified thee, I have finished the work that thou gavest me to do*, Joh. 17. 5. This thread, which runs through the

the whole of the Miniſteriall work, is not to be excluded here. Thoſe of whom there is hopes that they are willing to learn Chriſt, are to be taken into Chriſts School by Baptiſme, and thoſe are to be admitted to the Lords Supper that knowingly will engage for continuance, and comming on in the waies of Chriſt. Baptiſme is the entry door into the Church viſible; no man muſt be refuſed of whom there is reaſon of expectation that they will be profeſſedly Chriſts. And the Lords Supper is the means of the growth of thoſe that are thus viſibly and in the face of the Church received; where this may conduce to their building up, it is not to be denyed, ſo that the diſpenſers great enquiry muſt be, whom the Lords Supper may benefit, where it may edifie? which according to Scripture rules may be diſcerned and determined, otherwiſe the Apoſtle had not given this charge, *Let all things be done to edification*; and where it may edifie, to give it; and where it ſerves not for edification, to forbear it; not whether regenerate or unregenerate (which is an undiſcernable work), and accordingly to admit or refuſe.

SECT. XIII.

Propoſition. 11.

The Lords Supper with the Word as an appendant to it, may be ſerviceable to bring a man of Covenant intereſt up to the terms of the Covenant.

THere is nothing hinders but that the Lords Supper with the Word as an appendant to it, may be ſerviceable to bring up thoſe of Covenant intereſt, to the terms and propoſitions of the Covenant; may ſerve to work a man of profeſſion of faith, unto faith ſaving and juſtifying: a man in name the Lords, to turn unfeignedly and ſincerely to the Lord. This I ſhall endeavour by Arguments to confirm.

Firſt, Men of that intereſt, that baptiſme receives, as the intention of the work in order to ſalvation; theſe the Lords Supper ſerves, to carry on by ſanctification to ſalvation, as the end of the work likewiſe: But Baptiſme receives men of viſible profeſſion onely, and viſible intereſt, as the intention of the work into the viſible Church in order to ſalvation: Therefore the Lords Supper carries on theſe by ſanctification, as the intention of the work to ſalvation. The Propoſition cannot be denyed, unleſſe we will without

without reaſon, bring in that vaſt difference between theſe two outward viſible Ordinances, both intruſted in the hands of man, as that the one ſhall be of that latitude to receive men of viſible intereſt, and the other reſtrained to inviſible members; The one according to the mind of God ſhall let many into the Church for ſalvation, the other ſhall be in capacity to nouriſh, and bring on very few. The Aſſumption cannot be denyed, That Baptiſme receives men of viſible profeſſion and viſible intereſt in order to ſalvation, and hath been abundantly proved: we baptize infants upon the bare account of Covenant-holineſs, which is onely a viſible intereſt: men of years were baptized, (and by juſt warrant yet may, in caſe not baptized) upon a viſible profeſſion. The concluſion then followes, that the Lords Supper carries on thoſe as the intention of the work, that Baptiſme receives to ſalvation.

Secondly, If it be the mind of God in the Goſpel revealed, that men of viſible intereſt having not yet attained to the grace of ſanctification ſhould have admittance to the Lords Table, then it muſt needs follow that it ſerves as an inſtrument with the Word to raiſe them up by faith, and ſanctification to ſalvation: But it is the mind of God in the Goſpell revealed, that men of viſible intereſt having not yet reached unto ſanctification, ſhould have admittance to the Lords Supper: The Lords Supper then ſerves to raiſe up men of viſible intereſt by faith and ſanctification for ſalvation. The Propoſition is clear, unleſſe we will make mens admiſſion (moſt mens admiſſion) meerly vain, having no power, nor any capacity to advance their happineſſe, but being wholly in a tendency to increaſe their judgement. Whatſoever the ſecret will of God (to us unknown) is, that in the event it ſhall prove; yet the work it ſelf muſt have a tendency and power, reſpective to thoſe for whom it is appointed, for edification, not for deſtruction. The Aſſumption is evident (that thoſe of viſible intereſt, having not attained ſanctification, according to the mind of God revealed in his Word, ſhould have admittance) by the barres that are aſſigned for mens excluſion. The alone barres that are ordinarily aſſigned, to hold men in Covenant-intereſt off from the Lords Table, are ignorance, Error, and Scandal: But many that cannot be charged with ignorance, error, or ſcandall, are yet ſhort of ſanctification: Many ſhort of ſanctification then have no barre to their admiſſion. Either viſible intereſt,

with capacity to improve it, or saving interest in the Covenant must be the rule for admission: But saving interest in the Covenant cannot; then (to use Mr *Cobbets* words, Vindication, pag. 54. *it would either necessitate Ministers to come under guilt of sin, or anomie, breach of rule; or for avoiding of that which they must needs do with such breach of rule, never to administer any Church ordinances, since they sometimes shall break that rule in administring it to hypocrites; and albeit they do sometimes administer them to elect ones, yet not being able to know that secret infallibly, they observe not the rule in faith, but doubtingly, and so can have little comfort of any such of their administrations.* If any reply, that saving interest in the Covenant, is the rule, but we are not tied infallibly to come up to the rule, but as farre as our charity can judge men to be in grace, we must admit them to this seal of grace; To this I have several things to reply. 1. God never puts mens charity to this work, (as respective to admission to ordinances) to judge, whether in grace or not, whether regenerate or in unregeneration. And indeed charity (which is assigned by some to that place) is most unfit to judge. A Judge, or Umpire in a businesse must be impartial, and have nothing to byasse him on any hand. But charity would be ready to cover a multitude of sins, which is no blemish of the grace, but a demonstration that this is none of its office. If then man must judge, (as he is most unmeet) his reason, and not his love must take the chair for it, and go as high as conjecture can reach. 2. If charity or reason thus set up mistake, then the rule is broke; which though these will say is not the admitters sin, seeing the thing is not so *scibile*, or of possibility to be known, (and by the way we may observe that he is therefore no competent Judge) yet a seal is by this meanes put to a blank, which is no small prophanation, and the ordinance administred solely and necessarily for the receivers judgement. 3. Though we infallibly know a mans unsanctified condition, and were able to charge it; yet whileſt it is not open, and breakes not into scandal, we cannot upon this account (as is confest) exclude him from the Sacrament. That *Judas* received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper most of the Ancient held, as *Maldonate* on *Matth.* 7. 6. observes; we have large lists brought to our hands of names that go that way. The greater part of late Writers are of the same mind; *Ravanellus* as the last man, in verb. Sacrament. is peremptory in it, and there concludes

also

also the interest of all in Covenant, yet *Judas* was known to Christ, to be a thief, a Devil, and yet he receives him. Christ had doubtlesse power vested in him for his exclusion. The non-suspition of the Apostles, nor the close carriage of his treachery, could not then have excused his receiving, in case it had not been the mind of God that a man of visible interest, though unsanctified, might be admitted. And to say that Christ acted here as a Minister, and it was not fit that he should be both Judge and witnesse, though it be a truth, yet it serves not to take off the Argument. Had it not been the mind of God that men of his interest should be received, then Christ would not at any hand have knowingly gone against it, and given him admission to it. And what he did, according to the mind of God as a Minister, by a Minister may be done. And to pronounce him at that time, that he received it, such that had no right for admission, yet to admit him, were such a precedent as Christ would not have given. Christ would not trust himself with some upon that account, *that he knew what was in them*, Joh. 2. 23, 24. and he would not have trusted the Sacrament with such a one, in case he had not known that it had been the mind of God, that men of that standing should partake of it. If it be objected, that Christ knew that *Judas* was not in a capacity to improve the Sacrament for sanctification and salvation, being a reprobate: I answer, respective to his gifts wherewith he was endowed, he was in capacity of improvement. The Sacrament is of use to those that were his inferiours, and an eye is had to the tendency of the work according to Gods revealed will, and not to that which is in Gods secret purpose. Let us summe up the argument briefly into this form, Ministers must give the Sacrament, so as it may be to edification and not certainly to destruction: But they must give it to some not yet throughly sanctified: Therefore some not throughly sanctified may receive it to edification, and not to destruction.

Thirdly the Law and Gospel in their joynt strength, applyed in power to the understanding, may work men of Covenant interest up to the terms, conditions, and propositions of the Covenant: may work men of profession of faith, to faith saving, and justifying: may work a man that is onely in name the Lords, to be truely and savingly his. This none can deny, if Law and Gospel cannot do it, in the way of instruments, and ordinances ap-

pointed of God, there is no way on earth in which it can be done: But in the Lords Supper there is Law and Goſpel, the epitome and ſumme, the ſtrength and vigour of Law and Goſpel, applyed in power to the underſtanding: Therefore the concluſion followes, that the Lords Supper may work men of Covenant intereſt up to the terms of the Covenant, men of profeſſion of Faith to Faith ſaving and juſtified. The Aſſumption is clear, that in the LordsSupper there is Law and Goſpel, the epitome and ſumme, the ſtrength and vigour both of Law and Goſpell. There we have the curſe of the Law in the higheſt degree held out, Chriſt made a curſe, and bearing all that the Law denounces againſt ſin, even all that which ſinne according to the Law did demerit. There are ſins bruiſes, tranſgreſſions wounds. There we have the ſumme and ſubſtance of the Goſpel held out, Chriſts death for remiſſion of ſinne laid open. There we have Chriſt a curſe, which is that which the law inflicts upon tranſgreſſion. There we have Chriſt a ſacrifice, which is that which the Goſpel doth promiſe; all brought home, and applyed to the underſtanding of the communicant.

Fourthly, That which is high in the aggravating of ſinne to the conſcience, and clear in holding out the pardon of ſinne, may work a man of Covenant intereſt up to the terms and conditions of the Covenant, may work men of profeſſion of Faith to a Faith ſaving and juſtifying. This is clear, which way elſe are men brought up to faith and ſanctification but upon the ſight of ſinne, in its aggravations, and Goſpel tenders for the removal of it? The Aſſumption, that ſin is in this ordinance in the higheſt way aggravated, and the removal of it held out, is alſo clear, and may eaſily *perpartes* be proved. 1. The higheſt aggravation of ſin to the breaking of the heart, and the melting of the ſoul is the looking upon him whom our ſins have pierced, *Zach.* 12. 10. *They ſhall look upon him whom they have pierced, and they ſhall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his onely ſonne, and ſhall be in bitterneſſe for him, as one that is in bitterneſſe for his firſt-born*; and that we thus look upon him in the Sacrament; I ſhall chooſe to ſet it out in the words of the Miniſters, and Elders met in the Provinciall Aſſembly of *London* in their Vindication, where ſpeaking to thoſe that joyn with them at the Lords Table, pag. 104. *You muſt ſo remember Chriſt, as to find power coming out of*

Chriſt

Christ Sacramental, to break your hearts for all the sins you have committed against him. Christ is presented in the Sacrament, as a broken Christ, his body broken, and his blood poured out. And the very breaking of the bread, understandingly looked upon, is a forcible Argument to break your hearts. Was Jesus Christ rent and torn in pieces for you, and shall it not break your hearts that you should sin against him? Was he crucified for you, and will you crucify him by your sins? And besides, the breaking of the bread is not onely ordained to be a motive unto brokennesse of heart for sin, but also in the right use to effect that which it doth move unto. And, pag. 105. You must so remember Christ Sacramentall, as to find power comming out of Christ, to subdue all your sins and iniquities, as the diseased woman felt vertue coming out of Christ to cure her bloody issue: so there is power in an applicative and fiducial remembrance of Christ at the Sacrament, to heal all the sinful issues of our soules; there is no sin so strong but it is conquerable by a power derived from Christ crucified. And, pag. 106. You must continue in remembring Christ in the Sacrament, till your hearts be wrought up to a through contempt of the world, and all worldly things. Christ instituted the Sacrament when he was going out of the world: and when he was crucifying, the whole world was in darknesse and obscurity: and he is propounded in the Sacrament, as a persecuted, broken, crucified Christ, despising, and being despised of the World. And if you do practically remember the Sacrament of his death, you will find vertue coming out thereof to make you dead to the world, and all worldly things. And, pag. 107. Cease not remembring Christ, till you be made partakers of the rare grace of humility. Of all the graces that were in Christ in which he would have Christians to imitate him in, humility is one of the chiefest, Matth. 11. 29. Learn of me, for I am humble. And Christ in the Sacrament is presented, as humbling himself to the death of the crosse for our sakes. And what a shame is it to remember an humble Christ with a proud heart? The practical remembrance of the humility of Christ Sacramental, when sanctified, is mighty in operation to tame the pride of our hearts. And, pag. 110. To endeavour that your eyes may affect your hearts, when you are at the Sacrament. For as Christ in the Ministery of his Word, preacheth to the ear, and by the ear conveyeth himself into the heart: so in the Sacrament he preacheth to the eye, and by the eye conveyeth himself into the heart. And therefore it is well called a visible Sermon. What can be more plain

then

then this to set out the power of the Sacrament to soul contrition, true humiliation, and mortification? Too many that professe Faith have their hearts lift up, and live not by faith. Here is a way to bring them down, when they see sin to be of such a provoking nature, that onely the sufferings of the Sonne of God are able to satisfie, that their demerit doth put him upon a necessity of all these woes. These are certainly heart melting considerations: If it be yet objected, that the Provincial Assembly at *London* speak to their own communicants, whom they suppose to be in grace: To this I reply, that in case that should fail, and some at least should have their predominant lusts lurking, and treachery against the Covenant (as in *Judas* against Christ) harboured, it can be of no danger, to say that here is a means to work them on to humiliation, and brokennesse of spirit. 2. If any yet say, that their thoughts are otherwise of this Sacrament: I answer, their words best speak their thoughts, and we see what they say. The very breaking of the bread (say they) understandingly looked upon, is a forcible Argument to break your hearts, and the breaking of the bread may be looked upon understandingly by an unsanctified man: if there be truth in their Propositions, as I doubt not but they are most true, then my Conclusion is true likewise. We may make up (if you please) this part of the Argument thus: A sin aggravating ordinance is an heart breaking and soul humbling ordinance: But the Sacrament of the Lords supper is a sinne aggravating ordinance: Therefore it is an heart breaking and soul humbling ordinance. For the other branch of the Assumption, that this ordinance is the holding out of the pardon of sin, needs no proof. This is my blood in the New Testament shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sinne, *Matth.* 26.

Fifthly, That which is annext to the Word to second it, in that very thing, which works the soul unto conversion to good, may bring the person of Covenant interest, up to the termes of the Covenant; may work one of profession of faith onely, unto faith saving, and justifying. This none can deny: being added to the Word, as it's second in such a work, it well may have an hand in the working of it: But the Sacrament is annext to the Word, to second it in that very thing, which works the soul unto conversion to God. The Assumption is manifest: If we consider what the Word does for conversion, and the whole, in which the

energy

energy and power of it (as an Ordinance) is exerciſed, then we ſhall ſoon ſee, that this Sacrament is added, as a ſecond in that work. The Word converts, in holding out ſin in its defilements and danger; in the diſcovery of the loathſome nature of it, and the curſed effects that follow upon it; together with Chriſt in the promiſes to ſave from it. I know no other way that the Word hath to bring a ſoul in ſin to God, but in ſetting forth the loſt and undone condition of it, and ſo to bring to conviction, compunction, and enquiry what to do; and then to make tender of Chriſt. In this method, ſouls (as we find on record) have been brought home to God, of which there might be frequent inſtances. Now that this Sacrament is added to the Word, for further diſcovery of ſin, in the defilement and danger: to hold out Chriſt in his death, taking away ſin, need not to be proved. It is true that the firſt detection of ſin is by the rule of the Law, and therefore the Apoſtle ſayes, *By the Law is the knowledge of ſin.* In caſe the queſtion be put, whether this, or that act be ſin? then neither the tender of Chriſt in the Goſpel, nor yet the Sacrament can have any hand in the determination of it; but they both ſerve for the aggravation of ſin, to lay it open in the dimenſions and danger of it. Sin is no where ſo ſeen in its height, as in the ſorrowes and ſufferings of Chriſt, as is by all affirmed, and theſe ſufferings we know the Word holds out for converſion from ſin. And the viſible Word of the Sacrament ſeconds the Word in this very thing, to ſet out Chriſts death, to lay before our eyes Chriſt broken for us, both for the aggravation of ſin, and for the pardon of it. Thus if you pleaſe you may put the argument; If the Sacrament doth the ſame thing as the Word doth in converſion, then the Sacrament cannot be denyed to have an hand in converſion: But the Sacrament (as we ſee) does the ſame thing as the Word; it ſerves to the heightning of ſin, and the ſetting out of the pardon of ſin: Therefore it followes that the Sacrament may have an hand in converſion.

Sixthly, That which by frequent experience we ſee the Sacrament works toward, and for ought we are able to judge works unto, that we may well conclude, it is deſigned and appointed of God to work. This cannot fairly be denyed; yet if any think that this of it ſelf is not of full ſtrength, ſeeing our experience may deceive us, we may conceive what is not, Let theſe

then

then joyn to it what hath been already ſaid. This experience added to ſo much evidence of reaſon, I doubt not but will be found to have ſtrength in it. And I put it for their ſakes that ſay, Let any give inſtance of any man or woman that hath at any time been converted by the Sacrament. And that there are frequent experiences of the Sacraments working towards this thing is plain. How frequent is it with men to have affrightings, ſoul-ſhakings, tremblings, ſtrong preſent reſolutions againſt ſin, upon their approach to this Ordinance? being convinced of it to be a duty, that they ought to go to it. How mightily are their ſpirits often affected in it? If we make that an argument of the power of the Word towards wicked men in the affrighting and aſtoniſhment of them, in the terrifying and amazement, ſtopping for preſent their full ſwinge in ſin and wickedneſſe, as we know it is ordinarily with thoſe that ſet out the power of the Word: ſee Dr. *Reynolds* on *Pſal.* 110. pag. 150. why then ſhould we not make the ſame effects that we ſee ordinarily produced by the Sacrament, to be evidences of the like power in the Sacrament? And as we read of an *Ahab*, a *Felix*, a *Zedekiah*, an *Herod* thus ſtartled by the Word: ſo we may ſee and know ſuch as theſe alike ſtartled and affected at the Sacrament. Superſtition perhaps works it in ſome: But we find the work in others, in whom ſuch ſuperſtition hath no place. It can be no other then the Majeſtie of the Ordinance, the high aggravation of ſin, and the glory of Chriſt ſet out in it. All this I confeſſe many times comes to nothing, it is a fit and ſo over; it hath not the ſtrength to bear down mens luſts to a full change, and through mortification, and ſo it is with thoſe alſo that hear the Word. They are many times Sermon-ſick, and yet all ſoon falls and comes to nothing; yet in the nature of the work it ſelf it hath a tendency towards a change. And that this ſometimes works thoſe of Covenant-intereſt unto a true change, and through work of ſanctification (ſo far as we are able to judge,) there are not few experiments; I have known ſome bred onely for jollity and outward delights, that making addreſſe to the Sacrament have had thoſe ſoul-ſhakings and trembling amazements, that have put them upon a ſerious way of enquiry, and the ſpark ſo kindled by Gods bleſſing, hath been nouriſhed up into that burning heat, that their whole life hath been ſpent in zeal for God, and their name in life and death precious.

Seventhly,

Seventhly, To theſe we add, the acknowledgement of eminent Divines of an oppoſite judgement, who will have all admitted, preſent at the conſecration of the elements, to ſee the bread broke and divided. And to what purpoſe is their preſence, if not for their profit? and what profit can an unconverted man find in any thing in a ſpiritual way, that works not towards his converſion, that is no wayes uſeful or improvable for it? What others may judge I know not; theſe arguments to which ſome other might be added, have taken with me to conclude the poſition before delivered.

SECT. XIV.

Objections againſt the former Propoſition anſwered.

I Know that objections here are multiplied. I have read many, which in caſe they had been with me of weight, this that I am now upon, had been ſtifled in the birth, and more doubtles hath been ſaid then I have ſeen, and more yet happily will be raiſed. To go about to meet with all were to make no end of words: I ſhall ſpeak firſt to ſome general charges, after to ſome particular arguments.

General charges anſwerd.

Firſt, In caſe this holds, (ſay ſome) then *all upon that bare account are to be admitted to the Supper, who will hinder the converſion of any? yea even Turks, Pagans, and the vileſt varlots, may then come and joyn in this Ordinance.* To theſe I anſwer,

Promiſcous admiſſion follows not from it.

Firſt, Were it of power, as an inſtrument in the hand of God for converſion of all, yet all were not to be admitted, when the will and mind of God is known to be againſt it: The Goſpel in the mouthes of the twelve, when they had their firſt commiſſion, might have been of power for the converſion of Samaritanes and Gentiles, yet they are forbidden to make tender of it to them, *Matth.* 11.5. *Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Samaritanes enter not.* The word in *Pauls* mouth might have been (reſpective to any operation in it ſelf) the converſion of ſouls in *Aſia* and *Bithynia*, as well as in *Macedonia*, yet the Spirit forbids them to go to the former, and ſends them to preach to the other, *Act.* 16. 6. 7, 10. *If the mighty works*

which were done in Chorazin and Bethsaida, had been done in Tyre and Sidon they would hav repented in sackcloth and ashes; yet they were denyed to those of Tyre and Sidon, Matth. 11. 21. So that though the Sacraments had a generally converting power, yet in case they be appointed of God with limit to those of Covenant-interest, they may not in any greater latitude be dispensed, and so Jewes, Turkes, and Pagans are excluded.

Secondly, The Word it self (which is confest to be the power of God to salvation, and of the most large efficacy of any Ordinance for conversion) is not yet tendred to all, in any expectation of conversion by it. Not to speak of those to whom God in his providence doth deny it, (who are out of the pale of the Church) but those, to whom the Church doth not make mention of it: Infants, Idiots, distracted ones, and deaf persons, no Minister applies himself to them, to make tender of it for conversion; so that there must be not onely a commission to tender it, and a clear evidence, that men have (according to the mind of God) an interest, but there must be a present capacity in such for improvement. I am not ignorant that some (seeing it seems that this doth lye against them) have pleaded for a capacity in all these before mentioned, to receive benefit by the Word, demanding, 1. *Why are Infants, and* pari ratione *distracted persons uncapable of the Word?* An answer me thinks is at hand, because they are necessarily in the condition of the high-way-ground, to hear and understand nothing. They profit no more then those, 1 *Cor.* 14. that hear words in an unknown tongue. And in case they be in capacity (as is affirmed) to receive benefit from the Word, the Minister occasionally is to make out a word of exhortation to them, giving them their portion as well as others; which how it would sound in the ears of those that are of growth, and have their senses and understanding, let any judge. These further demand, *Where hath God said they shall be kept from it?* No more hath he said that the swallow, or the sparrow should be kept from it; by providenee they have been present, when those that would have improved such an opportunity in a Spiritual way, have been denyed it. Yea, places are produced to shew that God hath commanded infants to be present at Ordinances. But where is it commanded that Idiots, distracted persons, &c. should be present? Reasons may be given of infants presence at entry of Covenants, at solemn fasts, denuntiations of blessings and curses,

curſes, when yet they are in an incapacity to receive benefit by the VVord. Demand is yet further made, *Who knowes how God may work at the Word, though not by the Word? may not the Word be an occaſion of converſion unto infants, which is an inſtrument of converſion to elder perſons?* Such queries will bring in the moſt ignorant and ſcandalous to the Lords Supper; who knowes but that which is an inſtrument of nouriſhment of men converted, may prove an occaſion of converſion to men unconverted? So that this notwithſtanding the poſition delivered will not bear this inference that is drawn from it. Though the Lords Supper (as an appendant to the Word) may ſerve to bring up thoſe of Covenant-intereſt to the terms and Propoſitions of the Covenant; may work a man of profeſſion of faith, to faith ſaving and juſtifying, yet there muſt be ſomewhat more to give actual admiſſion to it. Put in theſe two Cautions. 1. That the perſons in queſtion have their intereſt and firſt right in it. 2. That they be in a capacity to improve it for their benefit; with theſe cautions, and not elſe, I am for a general admiſſion.

Secondly, It is objected, That *this makes the Lords Supper to be a converting Ordinance as well as the Word, and how great an odium lyes upon that opinion, what thoſe be that maintain it, and what intereſt they drive, is very well known.* To this I anſwer: The expreſſion of a Converting Ordinance may be taken two wayes: Firſt, As having power of it ſelf, as a ſingle inſtrument in the hand of God, in his ordinary way to work a change in the heart or life. In this ſenſe the converting power of it is to be denyed. Secondly, As having ſome influence for that work as ſeconding and working with the Word, ſo I doubt not but that it may ſafely be owned, and eaſily juſtified. I ſhall lay down my whole thoughts of it in ſome Propoſitions.

In what ſenſe, and with what limit, the Lords Supper may be called a converting Ordinance.

Explicatory Propoſitions. Affirmat.

Firſt, In the Affirmative.

Firſt, This Sacrament carries the ſoul on towards converſion, in doing the ſame thing as the Word does for converſion, in holding forth Chriſt crucified, in holding him out as our ſin, and as our Saviour, made a curſe for us, and delivering us from the curſe.

Secondly, In further engaging the ſoul, or the ſoul upon receiving the Sacrament engaging it ſelf to that which the Word requires and calls for. If Covenants in *Iſrael*, entred by reforming Princes, were judged to be of that force for obligation of

the ſoul to a change in their wayes, putting ſtronger tyes on their ſlippery hearts, much more may we believe that the Sacraments in a due order received, may have this efficacious power. *They ſerve* (ſaith Mr. *Hooker*) *as bonds of obedience to God, ſtrict obligations to the mutual exerciſe of Chriſtian charity, provocations to godlineſſe, preſervations from ſin, memorials of the principal benefits of Chriſt.*

Thirdly, The Sacrament doth this in an ordinary way according to the revealed will of God in his Word, as the proper intention of the work, and not as any thing extraordinary.

Fourthly, The Sacrament it ſelf doth it, in that relation in which it ſtands to the Word, in its being and operation; and not the Sacramentals onely, (as they have been called) as the Word preached, and prayer, which yet have a mighty influence on the Sacraments for this work.

Fifthly, It works as a ſecond to the Word for habitual converſion, as well as actual; In the way that the Word doth work, for the infuſion of the firſt grace, and not barely for the exciting and ſtirring up of grace in the ſoul. Their way of working I ſhall God willing in due place further enquire into.

Negat. Secondly, In the Negative.

Firſt, The Sacrament converts none by the bare work done. There is no ſuch power by receiving, to change the ſoul, as Papiſts believe there is by conſecration to change the elements. There is neither reaſon for it, nor promiſe of it. I cannot believe (for I ſee no proof of it) any regenerating power in the water in Infants Baptiſme, much leſſe can I have reaſon to believe ſuch a converting power of grown perſons in the Lords Supper. He ſhall be alone for me that will appear in ſuch Paradoxes.

Secondly, The command given, to take and eat of the bread, to drink of the cup, hath no ſuch power to convert. None can ſee the reaſon of the change of their wayes in any ſuch injunction; Converſion were an eaſie work in caſe this could do it.

Thirdly, The Sacrament of the Lords Supper muſt by no means be parallelled with the Word, in the work of converſion; but the Word many wayes muſt have the preeminence: 1. The Word may work to converſion without the Lords Supper; There are many in ſaving grace, that did never partake of this Ordi-

nance.

nance. Gods engagement by word and oath holds up the faith, and is the ground of ſtrong conſolation to thoſe that never enjoyed this ſeal. But the Sacrament cannot convert or do any thing towards it, without the Word. A Covenant may convey an intereſt without a ſeal, when a ſeal can never do it without a Covenant. 2. The Sacrament does nothing of its own ſtrength, but by vertue from the Word; It hath its dependance on the Word for being, as a ſeal on a Covenant, and alſo for the operation. The Word may go alone in the work of converſion, yet may have aſſiſtance from the Sacrament; the Sacrament can never work alone without the Word, but as an aſſiſtant to it. 3. The Word muſt qualifie the ſoul for the Sacrament, in laying open the nature and uſe of it; and the ſoul muſt attend what the Sacrament holds out, otherwiſe there can be no improvement of it for any ſpirituai benefit: And theſe things being premiſed, I wonder how any that ſeem to appear moſt on the contrary part can juſtly be offended, that I affirm, (and as I think, with ſo good reaſon prove) that the Lords Supper may be aſſiſtant towards converſion in ſome, and may work with the Word, to carry the ſoul profeſſing Chriſt up to it, eſpecially when it ſhall appear that I would have the door of admiſſion to ſtand at leaſt little more wide then they themſelves: And perhaps not ſo wide, as according to the practice of many of their judgment it ſtands already. Moſt of theſe acknowledge, that knowing perſons, free from groſſe errors and ſcandals, may be admitted; others ſay, none but they, that in the judgment of charity appear to be indeed in Chriſt, may be received; in which they yet confeſſe that men may be eaſily deceived: Either of theſe confeſſe, that many unconverted partake with them, even when rules of admiſſion (according to their own mind) are moſt tenaciouſly held. And in caſe it appear that theſe may receive benefit by the Sacrament, and their converſion poſſibly holpen on, eſpecially if well followed on by the Word, why ſhould they be troubled? I confeſſe it is to me no ſmall trouble, to ſee godly Miniſters of the oppoſite way, ſo much enſnared in their own principles, and neceſſitated to let in ſuch (where moſt of order is held, and diſcipline exerciſed) that of neceſſity further their damnation, and are in impoſſibility (according to their tenents) to improve it towards ſalvation.

Thirdly, It is yet further objected, *That in this doctrine we*

oppoſe

oppoſe the unanimous judgment of Proteſtant Divines, who generally teach, that the Sacraments are appointed of God and delivered to the Church, as ſealing Ordinances, not to give, but to teſtifie what is given; not to make, but confirm Saints; ſimply denying the inſtrumentality of Sacraments, that they are appointed of God for working or giving grace where it is not. And that we concur with Papiſts, who hold that the Sacraments are inſtruments, to confer, give, or work grace, ex opere operato. But how unjuſt this charge is, in both the parts of it, might eaſily be made manifeſt.

In this we Symbolize not with Papiſts.

Firſt, For that charge of joyning with the Papiſts, let any judge, who comes neareſt to their doctrine of the efficacy of this Sacrament. Not to mention the *opus operatum*, which is alike deteſted of both, (whatſoever is charged) but enquire further what they deliver of the efficacy of it. *Thomas Aquinas*, Part 3. quæſt. 73. art. 3. putting differences between Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper, aſſignes this for one; *Baptiſme is the beginning of ſpiritual life, and the entrance of the Sacraments. The Euchariſt is the conſummation of ſpiritual life, and the end of all Sacraments.* And further, *The receiving of Baptiſme is neceſſary to begin ſpiritual life; The receiving of the Euchariſt is neceſſary for the conſummation of it.* The Councell of *Florence*, quoted by *Suarez*, diſput. 7. Quæſt. 62. ſaith, *By Baptiſme we are ſpiritually born again, and are nouriſhed by the Divine Alimony of the Euchariſt.* Suarez, diſput. 63. Quæſt. 79. laies down this concluſion. *This Sacrament is not inſtituted, per ſe to conferre the firſt grace*; and confirmes it by multiplicity of Authors, and the *Churches cuſtome, who never uſed to give the Sacrament unleſſe it be to thoſe whom ſhe believes to be cleanſed from ſin by Baptiſme or penance.* And thus argues it by reaſon. *The Sacrament* (ſaith he) *doth not ſuppoſe the effect that it ſerves to work, but this Sacrament doth ſuppoſe the man to be juſt that receives it.* 2. *Meat* (ſaith he) *is not ordayned of it ſelf to quicken or raiſe the dead, but to nouriſh or ſtrengthen a man already alive. But this Sacrament is inſtituted, as meat and drink.* And though he after affirmes that *this Sacrament ſometimes, and as by accident conferres the firſt grace*, (which according to his principles he hath much a do to make out) *yet he acknowledges that many and grave Divines held the contrary*, quoting, *Gabriel*, Alenſis, *Bonaventure*, and *Major*. And their diſtinction is well enough known. That *as a Sacrifice offered*,

it

it takes away ſin; but as a Sacrament received, it onely nouriſhes, and inc reaſes ſpiritual life. By all which it appeares how farre thoſe of that part are from aſſent to this poſition; and no marvell, when they will hold their communicants in that ignora nce, as to look after no more then conſecration, to inquire nothing into the inſtitution. The way of the Sacraments work, as a viſible Word, as a demonſtrative ſign in the aggravation of ſin, and tender of pardon, is to them a myſtery.

Nor oppoſe the unanimous judgement of Proteſtant Writers.

As for the other part of the charge, which *is the oppoſition of the unanimous judgement of Proteſtant Authors*; I know many are produced ſpeaking of the Sacraments, as no cauſes of ſpiritual life, or veſſels to convey it; bnt as ſeales and teſtimonies of Gods good will towards us. To which I fully ſubſcribe, as after ſhall (God willing) appear. But how farre moſt of them come ſhort when they are throughly examined, of that poſition which is laid down as their opinion, *That they are appointed to ſeal unto a man that ſaving intereſt in Chriſt and the Covenant of grace that he hath already*, may eaſily be demonſtrated. Firſt, That poſition hath that confuſion in it, that many of them will not own, and is inconſiſtent almoſt with all their principles. This makes intereſt in the Covenant of grace, and intereſt in Chriſt (which is underſtood of intereſt as a lively member) the ſame, when it is well known that they make Covenant-intereſt farre more large then intereſt in Chriſt; ſee Mr. *Cobbet* in his Vindication, pag. 48. quoting not alone *Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory, Nazianzen, Jerome, Auſtin*, among the Ancient; but alſo *Ameſius, Chamier, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Pareus, Peter Martyr, Bucer, Melanchton, Mr. Philpot*, for this latitude of the Covenant. *Pareus*, (who is not looked upon as anydiſſenting man from the reſt of his brethren) ſpeaks fully. When it was objected that all Iſrael was not in Covenant with God, nor all the infants of Chriſtians, becauſe ſome among them were, and are reprobates, he anſweres, *To be in Covenant, or to have intereſt in it, is taken two waies, either according to the right of Covenant, or the benefit of it. He is in Covenant that either obtaines the benefits of the Covenant, which are pardon of ſin, Adoption, regeneration, ſalvation, or which hath onely the right or outward ſymbole of the Covenant.* He applies his diſtinction that, *that propoſition, That no reprobate is in Covenant with God, is onely true of the benefits of the Covenant, which heretofore were, and ſtill are peculiar to the Elect; but being*

ing underſtood of the right, and outward ſymbole of the Covenant it is to be denyed; for that indifferently belongs to all that are born in the Church, among which many are reprobates, as the event doth demonſtrate; neither is it lawful for the Church to exclude any, that by their own impiety do not exclude themſelves (which Iſraelites in times paſt did, and Apoſtatizing Chriſtians now do, to their greater damnation) whether they be of thoſe that by a true faith receive the benefits of the Covenant, or whether they be thoſe that remain hypocrites. All of his practice muſt neceſſarily be of his judgement, unleſs we believe that their practice militates againſt their principles. And that this is the practiſe of the reformed Churches in general, needs not to be ſhewn.

Secondly, They cannot then baptize any upon the account of Covenant-holineſſe, but onely holineſſe of regeneration. This is plain. If the right be theirs alone that have their intereſt as in Covenant, ſo alſo in Chriſt, onely theſe muſt be baptized, or elſe we muſt baptize without right. And that they do not onely baptize, but diſpute for Baptiſme upon a bare Covenant-intereſt without any further title is manifeſt.

Thirdly. This ſtands not with that which they hold concerning the way of the Sacraments ſealing, which according to them can be no evidence that he does believe, as ſome aſſert, evidences of faith muſt be in the ſoul, and not in the Sacrament; neither doth it abſolutely make up to the ſoul the benefit of the Covenant, then no man without infallible revelation (ſuch as it ſeems *Ananias* had concerning *Paul*) could adminiſter it. It ſeals the benefits of the Covenant upon Gods terms and propoſitions, which when the ſoul makes good, there is Gods ſeal for performance. That this is the judgement of Proteſtant Divines, I have elſewhere declared, Treatiſe of the Covenant, pag. 35, 36. ſo that their Doctrine of the Sacraments doth not oppoſe the poſition delivered.

Hitherto I have conſidered ſome generall charges againſt this poſition; now I muſt look into ſome Arguments in form produced againſt it.

Several particular arguments anſwered.

Firſt, *Sacraments*, (ſay ſome) *are ſignes, as appears in their definition, and not cauſes of what they ſignifie; ſignes declaring and ſhewing that we have Faith in Chriſt, remiſſion of ſin by him and union with him.*

To let that ſlip paſſe, making them no cauſes, becauſe they are

ſigns,

ſignes, as though no ſigne were a cauſe of the thing ſignified: This to me is as ſtrange as new, that Sacramental ſignes declare, and ſhew that we have faith and remiſſion of ſins. The Sacrament now in queſtion, is a ſigne of the body and blood of Chriſt, in whom by faith remiſſion of ſins may be obtained I know; but that it is a ſigne either that we do believe, or that we have remiſſion of ſin otherwiſe then upon our believing, (to which this engages, but not preſuppoſes) I know not. *Simon Magus* had not Baptiſme, to ſignifie that all his ſins were forgiven; but that by faith in the Name of Chriſt he might be forgiven. Mr. *Cobbet* ſayes well, Vindication, pag.54. *The initiatory ſeal, which holds true of the other ſeal, is not primarily and properly the ſeal of mans faith, or repentance, or obedience, but of Gods Covenant rather; the ſeal is to the Covenant: even* Abrahams *Circumſion was not primarily a ſeal to* Abrahams *faith of righteouſneſſe, but to the righteouſneſſe of faith exhibited and effected in the Covenant; yea, to the Crvenant it ſelf or promiſe, which had believed unto righteouſneſſe: hence the Covenant of grace is called the righteouſneſſe of faith*, Rom.10. I confeſſe it is a ſymbole of our profeſſion of faith, but this is not the faith ſpoken to, neither is remiſſion of ſins annext unto it.

Secondly, *That which neceſſarily ſuppoſeth converſion and faith, doth not work converſion and faith: But the Sacrament of the Lords Snpper ſuppoſeth converſion and faith.* The Minor is proved, *Mar.*16.16. *Act.*2.38. *Act.*8.36,37. ver.41. *Act.*10.4.7. All which texts are ſpoken of Baptiſme, and not of the Lords Supper. To that text, *Mar.*16.16. I have ſpoken fully, Treatiſe of the Covenant, pag.243. To that, *Act.*8.36, 37. I have ſpoken pag.244. To that of *Act.* 2.38. I have ſpoken, pag.396. and ther is no need that I ſhould repeat what I have ſaid. For *Act.* 2.41. *They that gladly received his Word, were baptized*, It ſpeaks no more then ready acceptation of the tender of the Goſpel; and whether this neceſſarily implyes ſaving faith, let *Ezek.*33.31. *Matth.*13.20,21. *Gal.*4.15. be conſulted. For, *Act.*10.47. *Can any man forbid water*, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, who have received the holy Ghoſt as well as we? it proves that men of gifts from the Spirit have title, ſuch gifts gave *Judas* a title not onely to baptiſme, but Apoſtleſhip; ſuch a faith may be had, and ſanctification wanting.

Thirdly, *That which gives us new food, ſuppoſeth that we have*

the new birth, and Spiritual life; and that we are not ſtill dead in treſpaſſes and ſins: But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper gives us new food: Ergo.

Anſ. 1. Metaphors are ill materials to make up into ſyllogiſmes.

2. A difference may be put between ordinary food, and living and quickening food: It may be true of the former, but not of the latter.

3. The Word as well as the Sacrament gives us new food, 1. *Pet.* 2. 2. and yet preſuppoſeth not new life. If any reply, that the Word is more then food; it is ſeed as well as food, and it gives not new life as food, but as ſeed. I anſwer that the Sacrament is more then food. There is a Sacramental work preceding our taking and eating, which ſome ſay may be done to edification and profit, by thoſe that are not admitted to be partakers; where they divide I may diſtinguiſh, and there Chriſt is ſet forth to the aggravation of ſin: to carry on the work of contrition and compunction.

Fourthly, *That Ordinance which is inſtituted onely for believers and juſtified perſons, is no converting, but a ſealing Ordinance: But this Sacrament is inſtituted onely for believers and juſtified perſons.* The Minor is proved, *Circumciſion was a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith,* Rom. 4. 17. *much more then Baptiſme; and if Baptiſme, much more the Lords Supper.*

Anſ. Upon this account it muſt needs follow, that as *Abraham* was a juſtified man, ſo *Iſhmael* was juſtified alſo, who according to the mind of God, and in obedience to his commands was circumciſed, *Gen.* 17. 23. yea, every Proſelyte that joyned himſelf to *Iſrael*, and every male in *Iſrael* according to this Interpretation muſt be juſtified. 2. Howſoever *Abraham* was a juſtified perſon, yet his Circumciſion in that place is not made a proof of his juſtification, but a diſtinct text of Scripture, *Gen.* 15. 16. quoted by the Apoſtle, ver. 3. And that Scripture ſetting out his juſtification to be by faith, and not by works, the Apoſtles words onely ſhew that the Sacrament of Circumciſion ſealed the Covenant, not of works, but of faith; ſo that Mr. *Cobbets* words quoted in anſwer to the firſt argument, are a full anſwer here.

Fifthly, *The Apoſtle argues, that* Abraham *the Father of the faithful, and whoſe juſtification is a pattern of ours, was not juſtified by Circumciſion.*

Circumcision. Circumcision was not the cause, but the sign of his justification. Therefore no Sacrament is a cause of our justification.

Ans. Though animadversions might be made on these words, yet if any will put them into form, I shall grant the conclusion, when I say the Sacrament, as an Appendix to the Word, may have its influence with the word upon a professor of faith to work him to the truth of faith, I am far from saying it is any cause of justification; I look on faith no otherwise, then as an instrument in the work, and the Sacrament as an help, and not the principal to the work of faith.

Sixthly, There is an argument drawn from the necessity of examination which before hath received an answer.

Seventhly, *That Ordinance unto which none may come without a wedding garment, is no converting Ordinance: But the Supper of the Lord, the marriage feast of the Kings Son, is an Ordinance unto which a man may not come without a wedding argument.*

Ans. 1. Arguments drawn from parables must be used with all tenderness. But in this Argument here is much boldness, to make this Ordinance that marriage-feast. 2. We shall find if we look to the scope of it, that this feast is the fruition of Christ in his Kingdom, as appears by those words that give occasion to the Parable of the Supper, *Luk.* 14.15. *And when one of them that sate at meat with him, heard these things, he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God.* Now those that pretend a forwardness towards it and are not prepared and fitted for it, (according to the scope of the Parable) shall be cast out from it. This therefore may fairly prove that none that appear in Ordinances, and yet remaine in their sins, shall come to heaven; But it no more proves that a man cannot get saving good by this Ordinance, then it proves that a man cannot get saving good by the Word; The VVord may lay as fair a claime to this wedding feast, as the Lords Supper.

Eighthly, *That Ordinance which is not appointed to work faith, is no converting Ordinance: But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is not appointed to work faith; Ergo.* The Assumption is proved, *Rom.* 10.14. *Faith cometh by hearing, hearing by the Word of God; then not by seeing; if by the Word, then not by the Sacrament.*

Ans. If faith comes by hearing, will it therefore follow that hearing can receive no help from, but must exclude seeing?

Did the *Bereans* when they had heard the Apoſtles, yet nothing towards faith by their ſearch of the Scriptures? *Act.* 17. 11.12. or did they not make uſe of their eyes in the ſearch that they made? When Chriſt had Preached to the Jewes not yet in the faith, and commended to them the ſearch of the Scriptures, *Joh.* 5.39. can we think that this ſearch could be no ſtep in their way of believing? Why were miracles wrought, if they were of no uſe to the work of faith? What comment ſhall we make on thoſe words, *Joh.*2.23. *Many believed in his Name when they ſaw the miracles that were done?* If the Word do work faith, it will by no means follow, but that it may take in aſſiſtance by miracles, and Saeraments, by ſignes extraordinary and ordinary. That conſequence, if by the Word, then not by the Sacrament, will never hold, till the VVord and Sacrament are proved to be oppoſite, and not ſubordinate.

Ninthly, *That Ordinance, which hath neither the promiſe of the grace of converſion annext unto it, or any example in the Word of God of any converted by it, is no converting Ordinance: But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper hath no ſuch promiſe of the grace of converſion, neither is there ſuch an example*: Ergo.

Anſw. For Examples, though we could give inſtances of men being converted by receiving of the Lords Supper, yet it would ſtill be denyed to have any poſſible influence towards converſion; as the laſt Argument is an evident witneſſe. We bring Examples of men that have been brought to the faith by ſeeing, and yet it is ſtill denyed that ſight can be any help towards it. And though we could bring a promiſe of ſuch grace annext, yet we ſhould have little hopes to be heard or heeded, ſeeing we can bring a Promiſe of bleſſedneſſe to reading, which is by ſight, as to hearing, *Rev.* 1. 3. *Bleſſed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this Prophecy.* 2. We have as many examples of mens converſion by the Sacrament, as we have of their receiving ſtrength and nouriſhment: If one may be aſſerted without an example, then the other likewiſe. 3. We have no particular precedents by name (except at firſt inſtitution) of any that were Communicants, and therefore we cannot expect examples of converſion, or receiving of ſtrength by communicating. 4. The examples of converſion by the Word perhaps well examined, would prove ſhort of ſuch converſion as here is intended. The converſion in Goſpel narratives is to a Chriſtian profeſſion. A

man

man may evince calling thence, but not election, and this is the work of the Word without the Sacrament, ſeeing it muſt precede the receiving of the Sacrament.

As to that of no promiſe made to it, 1. When the adverſary ſhall bring a promiſe made to the Sacrament for ſpiritual ſtrength, it will happily be found of an equal force to the giving of a new life. 2. Though we have no promiſe explicite, and expreſſe; yet we have promiſes implicite and virtual. Every promiſe made to the Word is made to the Sacrament: The Sacrament being not oppoſite, but ſubordinate to it, an appendant that receives ſtrength from it.

Tenthly, *That Ordinance whereof Chriſt would have no unworthy perſon to partake, is not a converting Ordinance: But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance whereof Chriſt would have no unworthy perſon to partake*: Ergo. *The Minor is proved*, 1 Cor. 11. 27.

Anſw. This Argument well followed will take off every Ordinance from that honour of converſion, as well as this of the Lords Supper: ſeeing many Texts may be produced, equally calling for qualifications for them as for this, equally ſhewing the danger of unworthy addreſſes. As to this for hearing the Word, ſee 1 *Pet.* 2. 1, 2. *Wherefore laying aſide all malice, and all guile, and hypocriſies, and envies, and all evill ſpeakings, as new-born babes deſire the ſincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby.* Jam. 1. 21. *Wherefore lay apart all filthineſſe, and ſuperfluity of naughtineſſe, and receive with meekneſſe the engraffed Word, which is able to ſave your ſoules.* Is not the Word a ſavour of death unto death to ſuch? 2 *Cor.* 2. 14, 15, 16. Shall it not be more tolerable for *Tyre* and *Zidon* then for them? *Matth.* 11. 24. For prayer to God, ſee *James* 1. 6, 7. *But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering; for he that wavereth is like a wave of the Sea, driven with the wind and toſſed; for let not that man think he ſhall receive any thing of the Lord*, 1 Tim. 2. 8. *I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting: Good will never be had by ſuch mens prayers.* Eſay 1. 15. *And when ye ſpread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear, your hands are full of blood.* Zach. 7. 13. *Therefore it is come to paſſe, that as he cryed, and they would not hear: ſo they cryed, and I would not hear, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts.* Shall we now ſay, that neither Word, nor prayer is a converting Ordinance? But perhaps it will

will be said, *Men unworthy must hear, must pray to be made worthy, must come in unconversion to be converted. But they must bring worthinesse hither, or else this can have no hand in making worthy; they must bring conversion, or else this cannot convert.* This is a begging of the question. And as to prayer, there is no more ground, or colour to make it a converting Ordinance, then the Supper; we must pray in faith, before we can pray with acceptance of our persons, and so must the Word be *mixt with faith when we hear it*, Heb. 4. 2.

Eleventhly, *That Ordinance which is eucharisticall, and consolatory, supposeth such that partake of it to have part and portion in that thing for which thanks is given, and are such as are fit to be comforted: But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance eucharisticall and consolatory*: Ergo.

Answ. And might not the Assumption as well have been, That the Word and Prayer are Ordinances eucharistical, and consolatory? I hope none will deny the Gospel (our good tydings) to be eucharistical, and consolatory; nor yet thanksgiving, which is a branch of prayer. And then in case the Proposition be of universal truth, both Word, Prayer, and Lords Supper, are excluded from any power of conversion; The Proposition then must be understood with limit, and restriction: That Ordinance, which in whole and in part is eucharistical and consolatory, can have no hand in conversion, and then (though perhaps exception might be taken at it) it had colour in it: But then the Assumption, That *this Ordinance is in whole and in part eucharisticall and consolatory*, must be denyed. It is for humbling, heart-breaking, as it is comforting: There we shew forth Christs death, and see him broken for sin; and it is no matter of consolation, but humiliation and horrour to see our soules under that guilt that brought upon Christ a necessity to suffer; Though it is a matter of consolation, that guilt by suffering is removed, and an atonement made, in which there is either present assurance, or at least a possibility of futnre actuall interest.

Twelfthly, *That Ordinance, unto which Christ calleth none but such that have spiritual gracious qualifications, is not a converting, but a sealing Ordinance: But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance unto which Christ calleth none but such as have spiritual and gracious qualifications; Ergo.* The Assumption is proved, *Matth.* 11. 28.

28. *Joh.* 7. 37. *Isa.* 55. 1. *Matth.* 22. 12. 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. *Cant.* 5. 1.

Answ. Onely one of these speaks of the Lords Supper, the rest have immediate relation to Christ, not to this Ordinance of the Supper: and positive spiritual qualifications, as preceding all coming, is not required in any of them; upon sense of want, we may come to Christ for spiritual qualifications; (as we may come with them) though without positive spiritual qualifications there is no assurance of interest in him. 2. As to that worthinesse which is spoken to, in that Text of the *Corinthians*, there is an usual distinction of worthinesse of *merit*, and worthinesse *suitable to the work in hand*; It is the latter onely, that, as is confest, is called for. There is yet a double suitableness to the work: One is compleat, answering to all that the work can call for, which comprises grace, not onely in the habit, but in the act; an actual improvement of our graces for the participation of it; and this is alike required in other Ordinances of hearing, praying, &c. as in this Ordinance of communicating. The other is a worthinesse, respecting the person that doth communicate: such a worthinesse of suitableness and conveniency, whereby according to the measure of grace vouchsafed (whether common, or saving) he addresseth himself to it. Now though the regenerate man alone receives to the acceptation of his person, as he onely hears and prayes with such acceptance: yet a man in unregeneration may be so far suitably worthy for this work, that he may know himself called unto it, and that it would be his sin to hold back from it: and he may hopefully expect a blessing in it: and such a worthinesse was in Christs and *John Baptists* hearers, so many of them as have their commendations in the Gospel for such ready and forward hearing; and such a worthinesse, as I take it, is mentioned, *Matth.* 10 11. Let the Learned consider, whether either the word ἀναξίως, *indignè*, or the context in that place will necessarily take in every unregenerate man, or rather the irreverend prophanation of that duty; and whether arguments drawn from want of saving faith, and sincere repentance in performance of this work, do not bring unregenerate men under like danger in fasting, praying, thanksgiving, hearing, Sabbath-keeping, and every other duty of worship whatsoever.

Thirteenthly, *That Ordinance which is instituted for the Communion*

will be said, *Men unworthy must hear, must pray to be made worthy, must come in unconversion to be converted. But they must bring worthinesse hither, or else this can have no hand in making worthy; they must bring conversion, or else this cannot convert.* This is a begging of the question. And as to prayer, there is no more ground, or colour to make it a converting Ordinance, then the Supper; we must pray in faith, before we can pray with acceptance of our persons, and so must the Word be *mixt with faith when we hear it*, Heb. 4. 2.

Eleventhly, *That Ordinance which is eucharisticall, and consolatory, supposeth such that partake of it to have part and portion in that thing for which thanks is given, and are such as are fit to be comforted: But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance eucharisticall and consolatory*: Ergo.

Answ. And might not the Assumption as well have been, That the Word and Prayer are Ordinances eucharistical, and consolatory? I hope none will deny the Gospel (our good tydings) to be eucharistical, and consolatory; nor yet thanksgiving, which is a branch of prayer. And then in case the Proposition be of universal truth, both Word, Prayer, and Lords Supper, are excluded from any power of conversion; The Proposition then must be understood with limit, and restriction: That Ordinance, which in whole and in part is eucharistical and consolatory, can have no hand in conversion, and then (though perhaps exception might be taken at it) it had colour in it: But then the Assumption, That *this Ordinance is in whole and in part eucharisticall and consolatory*, must be denyed. It is for humbling, heart-breaking, as it is comforting: There we shew forth Christs death, and see him broken for sin; and it is no matter of consolation, but humiliation and horrour to see our soules under that guilt that brought upon Christ a necessity to suffer; Though it is a matter of consolation, that guilt by suffering is removed, and an atonement made, in which there is either present assurance, or at least a possibility of futnre actuall interest.

Twelfthly, *That Ordinance, unto which Christ calleth none but such that have spiritual gracious qualifications, is not a converting, but a sealing Ordinance: But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance unto which Christ calleth none but such as have spiritual and gracious qualifications; Ergo.* The Assumption is proved, *Matth.* 11. 28.

28. *Joh.* 7. 37. *Isa.* 55. 1. *Matth.* 22. 12. 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. *Cant.* 5. 1.

Answ. Onely one of these speaks of the Lords Supper, the rest have immediate relation to Christ, not to this Ordinance of the Supper: and positive spiritual qualifications, as preceding all coming, is not required in any of them; upon sense of want, we may come to Christ for spiritual qualifications; (as we may come with them) though without positive spiritual qualifications there is no assurance of interest in him. 2. As to that worthinesse which is spoken to, in that Text of the *Corinthians*, there is an usual distinction of worthinesse of *merit*, and worthinesse *suitable to the work in hand*; It is the latter onely, that, as is confest, is called for. There is yet a double suitableness to the work: One is compleat, answering to all that the work can call for, which comprises grace, not onely in the habit, but in the act; an actual improvement of our graces for the participation of it; and this is alike required in other Ordinances of hearing, praying, &c. as in this Ordinance of communicating. The other is a worthinesse, respecting the person that doth communicate: such a worthinesse of suitableness and conveniency, whereby according to the measure of grace vouchsafed (whether common, or saving) he addresseth himself to it. Now though the regenerate man alone receives to the acceptation of his person, as he onely hears and prayes with such acceptance: yet a man in unregeneration may be so far suitably worthy for this work, that he may know himself called unto it, and that it would be his sin to hold back from it: and he may hopefully expect a blessing in it: and such a worthinesse was in Christs and *John Baptists* hearers, so many of them as have their commendations in the Gospel for such ready and forward hearing; and such a worthinesse, as I take it, is mentioned, *Matth.* 10 11. Let the Learned consider, whether either the word ἀναξίως, *indignè*, or the context in that place will necessarily take in every unregenerate man, or rather the irreverend prophanation of that duty; and whether arguments drawn from want of saving faith, and sincere repentance in performance of this work, do not bring unregenerate men under like danger in fasting, praying, thanksgiving, hearing, Sabbath-keeping, and every other duty of worship whatsoever.

Thirteenthly, *That Ordinance which is instituted for the Communi-*

munion of Saints, is intended onely for ſuch as are Saints, and not for unconverted ſinners: But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance inſtituted for the Communion of Saints, and thoſe that are members of the ſame body of Chriſt. The aſſumption is proved, 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. *compared with* 1 Cor. 1. 2.

Anſw. Saint, is either ſuch that are ſo by calling and ſeparation for God, or elſe by qualifications and regeneration from God. In the former ſenſe, unconverted ſinners, profeſſing the Goſpel, are Saints: as of old they were of the people of God, and called by his Name: Saint is a New Teſtament-word, taking in all of a Chriſtian profeſſion, and outward Covenant-intereſt, and then the Propoſition is to be denyed; Saint being taken in the latter ſenſe, the aſſumption is falſe. This Lords Supper is a priviledge of the Church as viſible, diſpenſed by viſible officers, not as inviſible, as thoſe very Texts quoted do manifeſt.

Fourteenthly, *If Baptiſme it ſelf (at leaſt when adminiſtred to thoſe that are of age) is not a regenerating or converting Ordinance, far leſſe is the Lords Supper a regenerating or converting Ordinance: But Baptiſme it ſelf (at leaſt when miniſtred to thoſe that are of age) is not a regenerating or converting Ordinance:* Ergo.

Anſw. This Argument ſeemeth to ſuppoſe an opinion of regeneration or converſion, by the very work done in Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper; which ſeeing I do not own, but in either of both diſclaim, I need to give no further anſwer.

Fifteenthly, *If the Baptiſme even of thoſe that are at age muſt neceſſarily precede the receiving of the Lords Supper, then the Lords Supper is not a converting, but a ſealing Ordinance: But Baptiſme even of thoſe that are of age muſt neceſſarily precede the Lords Supper:* Ergo.

Anſw. I ſee no neceſſity of this conſequence, unleſſe I ſhould believe that all that are baptized, are *ipſo facto* regenerate; and that not with an initial regeneration (of which ſome ſpeak) that may be loſt, but the immortal ſeed of the Spirit that abides for ever: But being not (as I am not) of that faith, I ſuppoſe a baptized man may be (to uſe *Pareus* his phraſe) *Chriſtianus non regeneratus, ſed regenerandus*, a Chriſtian not regenerate, but to be regenerate: and ſo regeneration may, as ordinarily it doth, not precede, but follow Baptiſme.

Sixteenthly, There is an Argument drawn from the Parable of

of the Prodigal, *There is a robe, ring, and ſhoes put upon him, and a fatted calf killed for him, but this when he comes to himſelf, and ſayes, Father, I have ſinned, &c. But this is done in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper more eſpecially, and manifeſtly then in any other Ordinace:* Ergo.

Anſw. All Ordinances (as I take it) are to bring a prodigal unto ſuch a returning poſture, in the diſcovery of the hatefulneſſe of ſin againſt ſuch a Father, and the riches that are in his Fathers family. There are ſome Arguments of this nature follow, which may ſeaſonably be ſpoke to in the cloſe of theſe Propoſitions. I ſhall onely here by the way, hint ſo much to the Reader, that in caſe theſe Arguments had been framed againſt the power of this Sacrament, for converſion in the ſenſe as generally the oppoſers of it underſtand it, that it works, as a medicine to heal, and hath an *opus operatum* in it: I ſhould not at all have undertaken them, how inconcluding ſoever I had judged them: But ſeeing a tendency in them, to intereſt alone, men already in grace in this Ordinance, and denying all hope of benefit by it, to the majority of thoſe that men of all intereſts ordinarily admit to it, to the neceſſary enſnaring of all that are concerned in the adminiſtration of it, I could not be ſilent; let the Reader impartially weigh and determine.

SECT. XV.

Propoſition. 12.

All of preſent incapacity to receive benefits by the Lords Supper, are to be denyed acceſſe to it.

THoſe that are in a preſent inaptitude, and incapacity to improve this Sacrament to any ſpiritual advantage, but are under an inevitable neceſſity, either to receive no good, or much danger, and damage (whatſoever intereſt they may claim, or on their behalf may be claimed) are juſtly debarred from it, and in preſent denyed admiſſion to it. And on the contrary, *All that are in a preſent aptitude, and capacity to improve it for ſpiritual advantages are regularly to be received, and by no means to be denyed.* This is plain, it muſt be adminiſtred to the Churches advantage, and edification, unto every members poſſible advantage; They that are in an utter incapacity to receive benefit, are in all reaſon to

be denyed it, and thoſe of capacity to be received to it. Some would have thoſe debarred (or at leaſt to debar themſelves) that hopefully may profit; and we may not plead for their admiſſion, that are, in the judgment of all reaſon, in an incapacity of profiting. Thoſe that ſtand in this preſent incapacity, are of two ſorts: 1. Such that through inabilities cannot make any improvement of it. 2. Such that reſolvedly, and obſtinately will not.

Thoſe that through inability cannot, are of four ſorts.

Firſt, Thoſe that by reaſon of minority and non-age are not yet ripe for the uſe of reaſon, as Infants, and younglings.

Secondly, Thoſe that by providence are denyed it, as natural idiots.

Thirdly, Thoſe that are bereft of it, as diſtracted perſons, aged perſons grown children.

Fourthly, Thoſe that by their groſſe neglect in ſpiritual things, never made improvement of it.

Firſt, *Infants*, Theſe the Church, as well Popiſh, as reformed by an univerſall received cuſtome denies to admit; As the Diſciples ſometimes rebuked thoſe that brought infants to Chriſt to receive a bleſſing: ſo the Church now provides, that none ſhall bring them to partake of this Sacrament. And though the Diſciples ſuffered a check from our Saviours mouth in the one, Infants having title to, and being in a capacity to receive benefit by that Church-privileg, as being Church-member: yet we believe the Church is free from reproof in the other, upon the ground laid down before, *viz.* their incapacity to improve it to their ſpiritual benefit. It is true that the practice in the Church (or at leaſt ſome Churches) anciently was otherwiſe: as thoſe know, that are verſt in antiquity; ſeveral quotations out of *Dionyſius Areopagita*, *Cyprian*, *Auſtin*, *the Councell of Tolet*, may be ſeen in *Suarez*, diſput. 62. quæſt. 79. Art. 8. ſect. 4. Though according to *Thomas Aquinas*, *Dionyſius* his words make not for it, as may be ſeen, part. 3. quæſt. 80. Art. 9. This cuſtome *Maldonate* in *Joh.* 6. 53. ſaith continued in the Church, 600. years, but he onely ſaith it; and *Suarez* in the place before quoted ſaies, it was never received of the whole Church, and perhaps (ſaith he) the practice was not Common, ſeeing there is no more mention of it among the Ancient; and quotes the opi-

nion

nion of some, that say, *The Fathers never observed this custome, but onely tolerated it, because they could not resist the multitude.* And one that speaks enough in favour of it, findes the practice of it in *Africk*, and *Europe*, but can bring no testimony out of *Asia* for it; onely he saies, that he does not read, that the custome was contrary in any part of *Asia*. The Schooles have disputed infants capacity of it; *Thomas Aquinas*, in the place quoted, is against it, together with many others, whose names *Suarez* mentions. *Suarez* himself is for the affirmative, that infants are in capacity of it, as that which (he saith) is farre the more probable, and hath most reason and authority for it. And in the conclusion hath much ado to excuse the Church of *Rome* for the neglect of it, as *Jansenius* hath for their Communion onely in one kind, *Harmon. Evang.* cap. 131. when the practice of all antiquity he confesses was otherwise; and *Bellarmine* for their eating on fast daies before the evenning against all Scripture precedent, *Bellar. de bon. oper.* lib. 2. cap. 2. But the Church of *Rome* her self hath reformed this, and hath not put our Reformers to the trouble of it, though a man might wonder what moved them to it, giving so much to this Sacrament as they do, to conferre grace by the work done, and to fortifie the soul against Satan. But it is plain, that the high reverence they gave to their transubstantiated elements, moved them to it, lest any thing unworthy of them should befal them; upon the same account that they deny their cup to their laity, they deny the bread to those that are in minority, see *Jansenius ut supra*: an eminent Writer of the Protestants appears much in favour of this practice, not upon the reasons that moved those Fathers, (which was a supposed necessity of it grounded on those words of Christ, *Joh.* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, understanding it of Sacramentall eating at the Lords Table) but on other grounds. 1. Those that are partakers of the thing signified, are not to be denied the sign. 2. Infants are of the Church, they serve to make up that body, and Christ the Saviour of the body. 3. Christ himself saith, *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdome of heaven.* And from each of these he drawes up formal Arguments for infants admittance. And he supposeth that that text which is brought as a barre to hold them back, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of*

that bread, and drink of that cup, may be easily answered, that it is to be understood of those onely that are in danger to eat and drink unworthily, and so to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, of which (saith he) there is no fear of infants. These Arguments undoubtedly are of strength to conclude their fundamental right and title, as to baptisme, so to the Lords Supper, but they are two weak, to give them actual admission; They conclude their *jus ad rem*, but not their *jus in re*; They have upon these grounds a first right, but they must wait a further growth till they have a second. Baptisme gives right in the face of the Church to all Christian priviledges, and this is a Christian priviledg; so also the hearing of the Mysteries of Faith, the highest of Mysteries, to be taken into debate of doubts, of the highest nature are Christian-priviledges, yet as every baptized person hath not forthwith these high Mysteries communicated to him, nor yet is admitted to such high debates, as Christ was at the age of 12. years which is recorded as a miracle: so neither are they therefore to be actually admitted to the Lords Table. And if that text of preexamination may be avoided, yet sufficient may be said for a barre to their admission. They cannot do that which is outwardly to be done at this Table, they cannot take and eat; see *Whitaker*, pag. 373. And in case the bread be put into their mouthes, it is more like to be cast out then eaten. They cannot answer the end of the Sacrament, to do it in remembrance of Christ, or to shew forth the Lords death in that ordinance; And so no possible benefit can be conceived in reason to come to them by it. In baptisme it is otherwise, there is nothing required to be done by him that is baptized. It is sufficient to be passive, there is advantage by it, the person (whether infant or of age) is enrolled into the society of the people of God, is a member of the body of Christ, visible, mystical: and upon that account interessed in the prayers and blessings of the Church: is enrighted, and upon that account as growth makes fit, to be admitted to other priviledges, and assoon as of any discretion to discern, they know to what societie they do belong, and accordingly to applie themselves; And therefore infants have a bare fundamental right to the Lords Table, but actual admission to Baptisme. And where as it is objected, that infants had not onely right to the Passeover, but were also actually admitted to it; they had not onely their *jus ad rem*, but their *jus in re*; and

consequently

conſequently infants have like right to the Lords Supper: To this I anſwer, 1. That infants properly ſo called, did not eat of the Paſſeover, being by reaſon of infancie in an incapacitie, for ſuch ſolid meats, as *Rivet* obſerves. 2. It no where appears, that infants did partake otherwiſe then as they were involved in the houſhould. There is no Ordinance requiring infants to repair to the place that God choſe for it; *It is for thoſe males* (ſaith *Ainſworth*) *which were free-men perfect, males in health, able to go up to the place of publick worſhip: quoting withal the Rabbies Authority, That all men are bound, except the deaf and the dumbe, and the fool, and the little child, and the blind, and the lame, and the uncircumciſed, and the old men, and the ſick, and the tender, and the weak that were not able to go on their feet.* When we read of the pains that they took to go up to *Jeruſalem* on theſe occaſions, through the valley of *Baca*, Pſal. 84.6. we hear nothing of their pains to carry along their infants, which muſt have been their care if by Divine appointment the Paſchal Lamb as a Sacrament had been ordained for infants. 3. The Paſſeover as Manna, and the Rock is conſidered two waies. 1. As common food, and means of preſent livelihood and ſubſiſtance. 2. As viſible pledges of Gods abode among them, and protection of them. As common food, and means of preſent livelihood, infants did eate of the Manna, and drink of the water of the Rock, and ſo alſo did their cattel, *Num.* 20.8. and young ones (as ſoon as able to digeſt it) of the Paſſeover, when they were preſent with the reſt of the houſhold: But as viſible pledges of Gods abode among them, and protection of them, or remembrance of their preſent deliverances; onely profeſſed believers, and neither infants, nor bruit creatures could make uſe of it, and in this ſenſe onely it was a Sacarment: ſo that we ſee infants title, and alſo their bar to this Ordinance.

Natural Idiots. Diſtracted perſons are uncapable

For thoſe that by Providence are denyed the uſe of reaſon, as natural Idiots, their caſe is the ſame with infants, as alſo thoſe that are beſt of it, as diſtracted perſons, and thoſe that by age, or diſeaſe are grown as Children: *Thomas Aquinas* in the place quoted diſtinguiſhes of diſtracted perſons, *ſome wholly want the uſe of reaſon, and ſome have onely a weak uſe of it; as ſome ſee not at all, and ſome have a weak ſight.* The latter in ſome caſe being reſtored in part to the uſe of reaſon, he would not have to be denyed; In this caſe prudence muſt judge, in caſe before this

ſtroke,

ſtroke, by the hand of God upon them, they were judged meet for this Ordinance, as they were for other civil employments, and now upon recovery or upon their intervals (as many times it happens) are able in ſome good meaſure to manage their buſineſſe; as way is given to them in one, ſo it is not to be denyed them in the other.

Groſly ignorant ones are in an incapacity.

For thoſe that never made improvement of their reaſon in ſpirituals, but being men of years, are ſtill children in knowledge, they have their title or fundamental right, (as I ſaid before of infants) but they are no more meet for this Ordinance then infants; ſuch I mean, that *for the time might be teachers, and yet have need to be taught which be the firſt principles of the Oracles of God.* If I ſhould demand, why boyes and girles as ſoon as they can eat of the Bread, and drink of the Cup, be not received to this Supper; but all in non-age by general conſent exempted, and therefore none offer themſelves? No reaſon (to me imaginable) can be given, but their inability of improvement of it to their Spiritual advantage; years of diſcretion are expected, and then they are to be admitted: and this is generally acknowledged to ſtand with reaſon, And what reaſon is there that without any diſcretion they ſhould be admitted at the uſual year of diſcretion? At one and twenty years men arrive at the age to enter upon their poſſeſſions: yet when it may appear that at theſe years they have not abilities to manage it for their benefit, the Law hath provided that they ſhall not be intruſted with it. The ignorance before mentioned in the ſeveral kinds was *ignorantia puræ negationis*, They underſtand not, becauſe God hath denyed them underſtanding: It is their defect or affliction, but it is not their ſin; this that we now mention, is *ignorantia pravæ diſpoſitionis*, a withſtanding of the light that is tendered and offered. All of theſe are in an equal incapacitie of benefit by the Sacrament: but theſe laſt in a ſinful incapacitie. And when the former, whoſe ignorance is not their ſin, are conſeſt to be uncapable, I do not ſee how ſin can put the latter into a better capacitie of it. When a Covenant was entered in *Iſrael*, Nehem. 9. 10. all ſorts and ſexes *having knowledge and underſtanding entered*, Nehem. 10.28. If any had ſworn to the articles, and had not at all underſtood them, ſuch an oath would have done no ſervice; therefore it was provided, that onely they that underſtood, ſubcribed, and ſealed. They that receive this ſeal, and conſequently put to their

their ſeal, when they know not the articles of it, or any uſe of theſe Sacramental ſignes, they ſee not themſelves at all obliged, when the Covenant of *Iſrael* was to be ſealed underſtandingly, the Covenant of the Goſpel is not to be ſealed ignorantly: A book in the hand of the unlearned that cannot read, is of as much uſe as this Sacrament to him that doth not underſtand. It is to theſe, as the painted frontiſpices that we ſee in many books, without any key to open them; they be full of myſteries, but the ignorant beholder ſees nothing but an outſide. He may gaze an hour together, and be as wiſe as before. Such an one ſees bread and wine, but what they mean, he knowes nothing, nor any proportion between ſign and thing ſignified, or what the Miniſters tender, or his own receiving ſpeaks to him. Theſe may (perhaps) have ſome blind devotion towards this Sacrament (which Popiſh Schoolmen judge ſufficient, if not obſtructed with mortal ſin) by reaſon of the Churches cuſtome to receive it, and ſome high opinion of ſome hidden and unknown vertue in it, but it is not the leaſt account that they can give of any neceſſity of it, as a reaſon of their devotion towards it, being ſcarce able to produce any command for it, not knowing either the author, time, or end of the inſtitution of it; much leſſe are they able to underſtand any need their ſoules have of it. When the *Corinthians* came unworthily to the Lords Table, all is laid upon this, that *they diſcerned not the Lords body*: I do not think that this is alone the ignorant mans ſin: All are in their meaſure guilty that do not conſiderately obſerve the glory of that Ordinance, and of Chriſt in it. A man of rude behaviour, in a great Perſonages preſence, is told that he knowes not where he is, or to whom he ſpeaks, when he well enough knowes, and needs no information; but doth not conſider his diſtance: but I ſay there is a neceſſity of that guilt in all that are ignorant. All do not conſider as they ought, that know; but none that does not know, can conſider. This is to be done in remembrance of Chriſt, which contains in it a calling into our thoughts all the work of his ſacrificing himſelf for ſin, which is never done by the man that knowes not ſin, that knowes not the Law, which is tranſgreſt by ſin; that neither knowes the nature of ſin, nor the guilt of attending it; that hath not any poſſible experimental ſenſe of the danger of it, and that remaines ignorant of Chriſt that redeems from it; being able to

give

give no account why the blood of Chriſt, rather then the blood of any other ſhould take away ſin; or how this death hath any ſuch ſatisfying remitting vertue, as to anſwer the Juſtice of God, or merit his Grace; neither knowing the Perſon of Chriſt in his humanity, or Deity, nor able to give account which Perſon in the Trinity took our nature, and gave himſelf a ranſom: perhaps they will ſay that Chriſt was God, and Man; and as ready to ſay that the Father, the Holy Ghoſt, were God and man in like ſort: knowing as little or leſſe of his Offices, what he does as a King, or what he does as a Prieſt, or what he does as a Prophet, for his Church. If you look on the Sacrament as a ſpiritual medicine, they never knew their ſoules ſickneſſe, nor ever underſtood any healing vertue in it. If you look upon it as ſpiritual food, for the ſtrengthning of graces, they never knew what hunger was, or any ſtrengthning vertue that here can be found: look upon it as a ſpiritual cordial, and they never had ſenſe of ſin to any ſwooning fit, nor yet knew any reſtaurative vertue to be found in it: look upon it as an heart-breaking, ſoul-melting Ordinance, as the Law never diſcovered to them the danger of ſin, ſo they ſee nothing here held out for the aggravation of ſin. They ſee what in courſe the Miniſter does, and what the Communicants do; But any end or reaſon why he, or they do it, they knownothing. If the Word which is added to the element to make up a Sacrament, were a bare Word of conſecration, to be muttered over the elements for their change, ſo that the bare participation would ſerve turn, (as Phyſick works without any regard of the Patients knowledge or ignorance) it were ſomewhat. But the Sacrament (as hath been ſaid) is a ſeal appendant to the Covenant of God, and there is no improvement of it, otherwiſe then as the Covenant and the Promiſe is improved, (which muſt be known before it can be believed and applyed) ignorance is a neceſſary barre to all benefit by it. Though I account it the weakeſt thing in the world, to make ignorance of this nature in the parent, any juſt ground of non-admiſſion of the Infant to Baptiſme. There is no neceſſity to conclude, that the child (who is born, and to be bred, in a vally of viſions, and intereſted in Ordinances able to ſave the ſoul,) ſhould unavoidably be ever held with Parents in blindneſſe; yet I can judge no otherwiſe, but that it is a juſt barre to the parents, when it is enough for the Infant to be paſſive, in his firſt admiſ-

ſion,

ſion, the parent muſt act and make uſe of his light, for further growth and confirmation. Some (I know) have ſaid, *Who can tell but the perſon deemed to be ignorant, and heretofore ſuch indeed, yet making addreſſe to the Lords Table, and there hearing that myſtery laid open, and the uſe of thoſe elements unfolded, and cleared, may in that very time receive competent inſtruction, and be put into a capacity for this Ordinance knowingly to partake of it.* Whether or no there be any abſolute poſſibility in this, I will not determine. I am ſure there is little moral probability, or poſſibility, that a man that hath lived under Ordinances 20, 30, 40, 50, perhaps more years, and all of this time hath been confeſſedly ignorant; and upon that account, in an incapacity of this Sacrament for his profit: that now at this time, in a few minutes he ſhould grow ſuch a proficient as to fit himſelf for it; And in caſe any ſuch thing, if not by miracle, yet, to wonder and amazement, ſhould happen, it will be little loſſe for ſuch a one, to delay his actual participation for once, that he may give an account of his profiting, and upon a further progreſſe in knowledge have admittance the next time with greater ſatisfaction. If any do deſire to know the *minimum quod ſic*, where is the loweſt pitch of knowledge, that will put a man into a capacity of improvement of this Ordinance to his advantage? this of neceſſity muſt be left to miniſterial Chriſtian prudence, in which there muſt be much of care and tenderneſſe, not to make blear-eyedneſſe, blindneſſe, nor a dim-light midnight darkneſſe, where the wretchedneſſe of ſin is known, and Chriſt (who is our remedy) ſo underſtood, that account can be given of his perſon, and that there is no other name under heaven by which we can be ſaved, and the Sacrament ſo underſtood, as that Chriſt crucified is there held out under thoſe elements, and tendred to believers: I durſt not paſſe a vote to have ſuch a one excluded, let this be got out of them, in language of any kind, ſuch that we may diſcern that they know it, though they can ſcarce expreſſe it: in which alſo many circumſtances ſhould be prudently weighed, as the natural ingeny of the party, if ripe in other things, it is an evidence of affected ignorance, to be heavy and dull here: The means that they have enjoyed for help in their knowledge, the longer at School, the better the Maſter, the more inexcuſable the truant: The growth of years that he had upon him, when he firſt manifeſted a care to know, age is unteachable in

comparison of youth, a low measure of light sometimes drawes on more strength of affections; But where sin is not seen, nor Christ known, and consequently the soul is so in the dark, that no use can be made of this ordinance, for spiritual advantage, the person may justly be judged to be in a present incapacity. In which for the most part, it will be more safe to delay, then deny to perswade the party to forbear a little time: and in the mean while to commend meanes of further growth, by all means to endeavour his help, that he may be fairly drawn on, and not driven back from this Supper.

In the next place, those that resolvedly will not make improvement of this Supper, but wilfully put a barre to their benefiting by it, are to be taken into consideration. And his is done,

1. By error entertained in their judgments, by a taint in the faith that they professe.

2. By viciousnesse of life, or a profligate course.

Now either of both these (to speak a few words of them joyntly) are either such that are so in private and secret, or else openly and professedly. Those that are indeed such, though in a way most secret, in the present posture as they stand, are in an equall incapacitie to make improvement of this ordinance, with him that most openly proclaimes it; *Judas* was unfit when he did communicate, as well as *Barabbas*, if he had communicated. But of these the dispensers of this ordinance can take no cognizance, they cannot follow men into their chambers, and closets much lesse can they make a scrutiny into their hearts. Here may be a just barre, when yet none may justly debarre them. Here there is almost an universal agreement; those that pretend to the the greatest care in their admissions, not dissenting, though it give no small check to that glorious *homogeneity* of which they speak in the Churches of Christ, and utterly overthrowes the definition given by many of the Church visible. He that pleases may read *Suarez* in tertiam partem Thomæ, disput. 67. Sect. 4. putting this to the question, *whether it be lawful to deny the Sacrament to a secret sinner desiring it publiquely*, and by many reasons determining it in the negative, as also in the following Section, resolving the question: who is to be accounted a publick, and who a private offender? And what is spoken by him of sin, may be applied to error.

Men wicked in secret cannot be debarred from the Sacrament.

Those that are openly such, by sufficient detection of their error or crime, are either such that are under the Churches censure, and stand excommunicate, or else they are such that the Church doth tolerate, whether because that censure is not in use in the place, or otherwise. Those that are under the Churches censure upon account of that sentence, must be deemed in an incapacity, when the sentence, whether for error or for scandal, hath had its due work for reformation (as upon the incestuous *Corinthian*) it must be supposed that the Church will again restore them to their freedome: in the mean space, whether the Church hath proceeded right or wrong, be over rigid or just in her censure, it is not in any one single Minister to determine. There is a famous story related by Mr. *Hooker*. in his Ecclesiastical Policy, of one *Bertelius*, that was excommunicated by the sentence of the Eldership of *Geneva*, and had procured from the Senate of the place, by common consent, under their seal, a relaxation, further decreeing (with strange absurdity, as the Author censures it) that it should belong to the same Senate, to give final judgement in matter of excommunication, and to absolve whom it pleased them. *Calvin* hearing the report of it, said, *Before this decree shall take place, either my blood or banishment shall sign it.* And two daies before the Sacrament, *kill me if ever this hand shall reach forth that which is holy, to them whom the Church hath judged despisers.* Men under publique sentence must be deemed to be such, as by sentence they are adjudged. But for others that stand free from censure, their present aptitude for this ordinance is to be considered.

Excommunicate persons are to be judged to be in a present inaptitude for the Sacrament.

First, As to them that are in error of judgement some (otherwise sufficiently asserere) would have all indulgence shewen, and men of all judgements admitted, enlarging liberty of conscience so farre, that it should exempt men (respective to their judgements) from any sentence secular, or Ecclesiastical; not considering that as we find one ordered to be sentenced for lewdnesse, 1 *Cor.* 5. so also others under the same sentence for errors, 1 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. 2 *Tim.* 2. 17, 18. And concealing (if it may be) that the same words that are produced by them, for cleansing the Churches of wicked persons, 1 *Cor.* 5. 6. *A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*, is by the Apostle applyed in so many words, to set out the danger of error, *Gal.* 6. 9. upon which account, doubtesse it is that some that professe so much zeal against looseness

Error in judgment, and wickednesse in life, equally indispose to this ordinance.

neſſe of life, and plead for ſo much indulgence, in difference in judgement, ever quote thoſe words out of *Pauls* Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, concealing that text to the *Galatians*, that it may not appear that there is a like danger in either; But whileſt ſome are over indulgent, others muſt not be too ſevere, but carry an equal hand in regard both of errors in judgement and in practice.

As for errors in judgement, they may be either immediately againſt theſe Sacramental ordinances, or againſt Chriſt the ſumme and ſubſtance of them, and all Goſpel promiſes in Chriſt. Errors of the firſt kind are, 1. Theirs that are above ordinances, either upon pretence of the Spirits immediate work, without any agent or inſtrument on earth, ſo that there needs not, either Word, prayer, or Sacraments, the opinion of *Swenkfeldius*; or elſe becauſe all is grown corrupt, ſince the Apoſtles times, that a company cannot be found with whom they may communicate, as *Muſculus* ſpeakes of one in his Common places, that had not received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper of twelve eares, becauſe he could find no pure Church in which to obſerve it. I fear ſhortly we ſhall have many ſuch; But we need not here trouble our ſelves with theſe, ſeeing of their own accord, they keep at a diſtance from us. 2. Theirs that look upon the Sacraments as matters either antiquate and obſolete, as belonging to the Churches infancy, in which it was indulged, thoſe carnal obſervances, too low (as they think) for grown Chriſtians; or elſe as things of meer indifferency, which may be uſed or neglected; ſuch are unmeet to be received. If any ſuch be detected, ſeeing though the ſubſtance of religion be not in the Sacrament ſo much as in the Covenant, yet a man of ſo low an opinion of this ordinance, of neceſſity debarres himſelf of any benefit of it. A diffident opinion of a medicine, or conceit againſt it, is ſaid to hinder the working; I am ſure it will obſtruct the working of the Sacraments, which have no innate phyſical vertue, nor any other efficacy further then our underſtanding, and faith makes improvement. For errors againſt Chriſt, the ſumme and ſubſtance of the Sacraments, (as every error is ſome way againſt him who is the foundation and carries on the whole work of our ſalvation) that which I have delivered, Treatiſe of the Covenant, pag. 232. (where I made it my buſineſſe, to give rules concerning ſeparation, when we are to ſtay with a Church, and

when

when to leave it) may here be taken into consideration, weighing both the kind and degree of these errors, and the place that they have got in the affections and resolutions. Those errors that necessitate us to leave a Church, when it is in the whole face of it tainted and polluted; may justly give occasion to deny a member accesse, in case he tender himself to this ordinance. These (as hath been said) are either such that render Christ in an uncapacity to be our Mediator and Saviour, or such that are inconsistent in whole or in part with his Mediatourship; of the former kind are those that are against his person. 1. Those that impugne the Godhead of Christ, such that though they give him the glory to be above Angels, yet will have him to be no more then a creature, a God in title and place, as are Magistrates, not in nature or power; an opinion that involves the Apostolique Church, and all Churches in succession, in Idolatry; giving the honour of God, the worship due to God, unto him who by nature is no God; a doctrine that will make Christ an impotent, and not an omnipotent head, too weak for his work, to governe the world, to bring under his enemies. 2. Those that deny his manhood, as having not taken our flesh, and so no suitable head, but a phantastique, or seeming body. Those that are against his Mediatorship, are either such that obscure, or some way eclipse it, (as every error doth that is any way considerable) or such that raze, if not utterly overthrow it, in some of the necessary parts of it, his Kingdome, Priesthood or Prophetical office. These are overthrown either directly, in termes of full opposition, or else by consequence; and this either is immediate and evident, (the truth being confest, they cannot be denyed) or else the consequence more remote, and not so easily discerned. These things being premised, we must bring it home to our purpose. 1. Where fundamental truths are not onely questioned, doubted, and disputed; but abjured and denyed, errors directly, or by immediate cleer consequence introduced, so that the fundamental truth cannot be known, but the error must be seen; Here is such a flaw in the Covenant, that no improvement can be made of the seal, to allude to that of the Psalmist, *Foundations are destroyed, and what can the stewards of the mysteries of God do?* Such a soul hath framed to it self, such a Christ as the Gospel never held out for his salvation: These are such (of whom the Apostle speaks, *Col.* 2. 19.) *that hold not the head, from which all*

Errors directly against the foundation, or by clear consequence, opposing fundamental truths, render the person uncapable of benefit by the Sacrament.

all the body by joynts and bands, having nourishment ministred and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God: and how can they then find any spiritual nourishment? When they thus withdraw from Christ, they are justly denyed to sit at his Table. But when the error is of an inferiour nature, as neither rendring Christ in an incapacity to be a Saviour, nor yet wholly inconsistent with the work of his Mediatorship; or at least, not such directly, but only by way of consequence; and that not immediate and evident, but more obscure, and remote: so that it may justly be hoped, that in case the consequence were seen, the conclusion that they draw would be best, rather then the principle of truth denyed, the case is then otherwise. As we might live in such a Church, in case doctrine of that kind were received and taught; so we may not refuse such a member, making his farther conviction, our businesse; where ignorance may stand with grace, there errour is not wholly inconsistent with it: And where there is any fair possibility that Christ may be, there this Ordinance is not to be denyed. And in case the opinion entertained, and contended for, be yet more foul, so that we have just cause, as the Apostle of the *Galatians*, to say, that their doctrine is inconsistent with grace; yet being not (as we can discern) fixedly settled, and resolutely received, and concluded upon; but with hesitancy and wavering, their faith rather staggered then destroyed, these should not hastily be refused; But as the Apostle gives counsel respective (as I take it) to private converse, After once or twice admonition reject: so let it be here, make essay to regain a brother rather then lose him. It cannot be conceived that the Apostle when he wrote his Epistle to the Churches of *Galatia*, would upon the account of their error how dangerous soever, have discontinued this ordinance as long as he saw any hopes of their reestablishment; though they were in eminent danger to be dischurched, yet he would continue Church-ordinances.

Men of a resolved profligate course of life, are uncapable of benefit by the Sacrament.

As for those that put a bar to their benefiting by the Sacrament by their vicious life or profligate course, most mens verdict is soonest of all other against them, with the Poets *Peribomius, Morbum gressu incessuque fatentur*, they have their faults written in their foreheads. And certain it is, that those men that are in their sin, and resolved for sin, in present can receive no benefit by the Sacrament.

First, They that look upon Christ to receive benefit in the Sacrament,

crament, look upon him pierced by their sins, and that with all sorrow and grief of spirit: The greatest grief in Family or Common-Wealth is borrowed to expresse it, *Zach.* 12.10,11. *They shall mourne for him, as one mourneth for his onely son, and shall be in bitternesse for him, as one that is in bitternesse for his first-born: In that day shall there be a great mourning in* Jerusalem, *as the mourning of* Hadadrimmon *in the valley of* Megiddon. Which was the mourning upon occasion of *Josiah's* slaughter, 2 *Chron.* 35.24. But these now look upon him suffering for sins with all pleasurable delights and content in sin: they see him under all this burden for our trangression; and in the mean time, take delight to add to the weight of it, and so stand at the greatest distance from acceptance.

Secondly, They that worthily shew forth his death, and acceptably keep a memorial of it, will not without horrour and trembling, have a thought of drawing upon themselves the guilt of it; we would not bear the guilt of the blood of the meanest peasant in the world, not of such a one that *Job* would not set with the dogs of his flock, *Job* 30.1. Such may say with *David*, *Deliver me from blood guiltinesse*: How much lesse would we bear the guilt of the Prince of life? To have this in our thoughts, that he must be our Judge, we have been his murderers, may indeed set pricks in the heart, as it did in *Peters* hearers, *Act.* 2.37. These men of sin that come to the Sacrament in sin, wilfully, furiously draw this guilt upon themselves, and become accessary to it: *He that sleightly passeth over the death of an innocent person, making a small matter of it, either he makes the innocent, to be indeed nocent, one that hath justly deserved to be slain, who being slain deserves so little regard; or at least he makes himself nocent, breeding a just suspition that he was, or would have been consenting to that mans death*, saith M. *Pemble*, pag. 33. These in the sleighest way passe it over, not with the least evidence of zeal or indignation against it.

Thirdly, They that judge Christ fit to be numbered with malefactors and transgressors, discern not his body, do not judge of him according to his glory and excellency, and so cannot with comfort come to the Lords Table: But these judge him fit to be numbered with transgressors, when in their foulest sins they dare joyn themselves to him, and have communion with him: This is their case that come in sin to the Lords Table.

Here

Here ſome may object, that according to the principles laid down, the Ordinance may be an hopeful meanes to take ſuch off from their wayes of ſin; having previous light to ſee what they do hear they may ſee high aggravation of their wickedneſſe; An heart-breaking, a ſoul-melting Ordinance being ſet before them, there may be all hopes that it may be efficacious unto ſoul-melting and heart-breaking; here they may ſee what their ugly ſins have done, and who it is that their ſins have pierced and crucified, whereof a Publican or Harlot may eaſilier be convinced then a Phariſee or juſtitiary. And Chriſt being here ſet out both bearing ſin, and a ſacrifice for ſin, the ſight of their juſt demerit in his ſuffering, and hopes of freedom from guilt by his blood-ſhed; there may be expectation of conviction, and contrition, and conſequently ſomewhat at leaſt done towards converſion: and upon this account ſome would have the worſt of men admitted to the view, though not to participation in this Ordinance; Others taking advantage of this admiſſion of them to the view of it, and knowing it to be a novel thing, that any ſhould gaze, and not partake, they conclude they are to be admitted unto both. The further improvement of it by them ſeems at leaſt ſome way hopeful, when to the ignorant and erroneous it is impoſſible.

That I may ſpeak my whole thoughts to this thing, ſomewhat is neceſſary to be premiſed, both by way of conceſſion and aſſertion. By way of conceſſion it muſt be yeelded,

1. That there is more weight in this objection then perſonally hath been acknowledged, which I ſee upon conference with many godly learned is more and more diſcerned. It is not ſo eaſie to evince all hopeleſneſſe of good in a bad mans receiving the Sacrament, as in a man that is groſſely ignorant; no text ſo fully and clearly to any grounds to put a barre to men in ſin, as to thoſe that are in ignorance; neither doth the nature of the Sacrament ſo clearly evince it. 2. Arguments uſually brought to conclude againſt their admiſſion to this Ordinance that are in wayes of ſin, and under no ſentence of excommunication, ſeem to me ſcarce concluding. It were too long to name the Arguments, and point out the exceptions: Some of them alſo periloufly enſnaring, and upon ſeveral accounts. 1. Their Arguments conclude equally againſt ſuch mens hearing, praying, and attendance upon any other Ordinance, as they do againſt their

participation of the Lords Supper; the ſame Medium where-with they conclude againſt one, concludes againſt all, as hath been ſhewn. 2. Theſe Arguments intended onely againſt the ſcandalous to conclude a neceſſity of their excluſion equally, conclude againſt all that are not actually in grace, when yet the diſputants themſelves will not yeeld, that either actual grace or poſitive ſignes of ſuch grace ſhould be any rule in ſuch proceedings, as to inſtance; ſome ſay that Miniſters in holding out the Sacrament to wicked perſons whom they have excommunicated in the Word, ſhewing that no unrighteous perſon ſhall enter into the kingdom of heaven, they abſolve them in the Sacrament; and if this have any force in it, it muſt conclude in this manner; None may be admitted but theſe that may be actually abſolved, and while they aſſume that the wicked may not be actually abſolved, others will alike aſſume, that no unregenerate man, how knowing civil and unblameable ſoever, may be abſolved. And the ſame guilt that theſe in their reaſonings conclude that Church-officers bring upon themſelves in admiſſion of the ſcandalous, they contract that admit of any ungenerate ones.

2. By way of aſſertion.

By way of aſſertion it muſt be delivered, 1. That the fundamental proper right unto, or intereſt in, this Ordinance is not queſtioned, Church members lay a juſt claime to Church Ordinances, viſible members to viſible Ordinances; If this be once denyed we are in inextricable ſnares. 2. Here can be no ſuch prophaneneſſe in promiſcuous adminiſtration of this Ordinance, as the putting of Gods ſeal to blank paper: There is no blank, but a name legibly written where there is a Covenant entered; and that there is a Covenant entered with ſuch, as it cannot be denyed by any that will confeſſe that the Scripture ſhould be umpeir; ſo it is yeelded by all of thoſe that baptize the infants of ſuch perſons. The firſt right of parents that are ſuch is taken for granted, when their children are thus received. 3. It is then an orderly edifying and prudential way in adminiſtration that is here enquired after, and this admits of a greater latitude then Covenant, and no Covenant regenerate or non-regenerate in which if an hairs breadth ſhould miſſe there were a tranſgreſſion; as we diſcern the perſon to whom it is meet to give onely milk, and to whom to give ſtrong meat, ſo we judge of thoſe that we admit onely to the Word and Prayer, and thoſe that we admit to the Lords Table. And though I ſee not concluding

ſtrength in ſeveral Arguments produced, but ſuppoſe they are grounded on miſtakes (which alſo apt to lead into danger, otherwiſe I had been ſilent) yet I cannot recede from that ancient received opinion of Fathers, Schoolmen, Proteſtants, whether of the Epiſcapal, Presbyterial, or Congragational judgement; that ſcandalous perſons are juſtly debarred from this Ordinance, ſeeing any poſſible hopes of gaining good is very low if any which yet is all that can be pretended for the expediency; and Arguments on the other hand for the inconvenience and danger, are many and weighty. Theſe Sacramental ſignes are not barely teaching, but engaging ſignes; and not barely ſignes, but ſeals, in which by acception of theſe ſeales, we engage to God to make good his terms and propoſitions. The Miniſter of Chriſt therefore hath little encouragement, and ſlender hope to tender it to ſuch, or to admit ſuch to it, that are in a continual way of Covenant-breaking, and proclaime to all their reſolutions in it. A continued diſſolute courſe of life ſpeaks no better then a full purpoſe, and ſetled reſolution for ſin; it can then little avail ſuch a one to take anew theſe ſymboles and badges of a Chriſtian profeſſion upon him, and put himſelf on an hypocritical profeſſion of the ſervice of Chriſt, making diſcovery of ſuch reſolution, it doth appear to be in vain to give this way and freedom to him. Knights of the poſt, that have often forſworne themſelves, are not by any prudent Judge permitted to ſweare; and thoſe that have ſo often deſperately broken Covenant, and wilfully gone againſt all former engagements, and ſtill palpably appearing that way, are as unfit to engagae; And the more clearly any that is produced as deponent appears to be ſuch, with more full reſolution any prudential Judge will except againſt it.

And whereas it may be objected, that ſuch upon the grounds here laid may as well be admitted to the Lords Table, as to hear Sermons, joyn in Prayers, obſerve Faſts: They are engaging Ordinances whileſt they are done by perſons in Covenant, as is receiving of this Sacrament.

Anſw. Firſt, They are not certainly ſo highly and explicitely engaging; The very name Chriſtian is an engaging tye indeed to Chriſtian duties and wayes; To enjoy any further Chriſtian priviledge is more; But to take theſe pledges on the tearms propoſed, hath ever heen accounted the higheſt.

Secondly, Though the Sacrament ſerve as hath been ſaid for aggrava-

aggravation of sin, yet as the Word is the alone means in the discovery of sin, so it hath infinitely the advantage in the aggravation of it. The Sacrament doth nothing at all in this work without the Word, and the Word does exceedingly much more then the Sacrament; and when it is clear, that the Word for so long hath wrought nothing for conviction, there is little hopes that the Sacrament will work any thing to aggravation.

Thirdly, As the hope of good is either low or none at all, so the danger on the other hand is high and full of terrour, as we see it by the Apostle aggravated, 1 *Cor.*11.27,28. The unworthy receiving of the Word is indeed of danger, and a savour of death to death; But the hopes are fair by hearing to be brought to worthinesse. The danger of unworthy Communicants is far greater, and the hopes little, if any at all.

Fourthly, The scandal here taken is exceeding great, and though happily sometimes weak ones take more offence then is given, and are offended above reason, yet when there is so little of good to be hoped in that in which they are so scandalized, and so much danger in the offence, it is by no means to be neglected.

Fifthly, There is more fair hopes of good to be done them upon their denyal then upon admittance to this Ordinance; when they see their own unworthinesse observed, and those proceedings upon it, they may more seriously reflect upon their unworthinesse. When a Physician shall forbid some meats upon observation of a patients disease, it is a way to make him more sensible that he is in danger: so when the Minister of Christ upon observation of mens wayes, shall deny this Ordinance, there may be hopes of an answerable work to bring the person to some more sad and serious reflections upon his own state and condition. If any think that these arguments singly considered, not to be of that strength to evince a non-admission of men of openly sinfull courses to this Ordinance, I shall answer in the words of the Assembly of Divines, unto the reasons of the Dissenting brethren against the instance of many Congragations in the Church of *Ephesus*: *Arguments of necessity are to be answerable to the things they prove, which as well holds in this of expediency or inexpediency*, to which I speak, as it doth in matter of fact, of which they speak; and so say they, *Though the several particulars of this proof should be singly but probabilities, yet being joyned*

together make a ſufficient proof, as many concurring likelihoods in Courts amount to a good evidence, and many leſſer ſtars make up a Galaxia. They are with me at leaſt ſo far prevailing, That I believe that ſuch are worthily excluded; and as they do not come without ſcandal, ſo they cannot come to their advantage. In caſe after a former way in ſin, or ſad fall to the ſcandal of the Church, upon admonition there appear convictions, and ſerious promiſes, the caſe is otherwiſe; there is all cauſe then to take in ſuch a one to this Ordinance, in which his ſin appears in the higheſt aggravation, and a tender and offer is made, and the way held forth of pardon and forgiveneſſe. Many of the Ancients were haſty enough to give the Sacrament to men at the inſtant of their death, as a *Viaticum* to heaven, when it was all too late to make any right improvement of it: But we are in the mean ſpace too ſlow, and over-rigid, in admiſſion of profeſſed penitents to it, as appeares in many examples. That of *Serapion* is notable mentioned by *Euſebius*, who had lived a great while in the Church without blame, but at laſt fell in time of perſecution; And often deſiring to be received again by the Church, no man hearkened to him, till at laſt being ſick, and ready to dye, he ſent a boy ſuddenly to fetch a Prieſt, who was found ſick by the meſſenger, that he could not come to him: But he gave the boy a little of the Sacrament, and bid him put it into the mans mouth: who when he had taſted of it, preſently dyed. That was expected here from the Sacrament, which it wanted, *viz.* ſome hidden power to carry up the ſoul for heaven and glory; and in the mean ſpace that was not ſeen for which it was inſtituted, A provocation to repentance, and corroboration, and ſtrengthning of the ſoul in wayes of holineſſe; when there was hopes of good to accrew by it, it was denyed; and when all hopes were paſt, it was indulged. After-ages appeared more facile, but then profeſſion of repentance was turned into a form of auricular confeſſion; they might confeſſe and take penance, and be fit for the Sacrament; and ſin as ſoon as it was over, and go again to confeſſion; That formality of confeſſion put the Sacrament as they thought into a poſture of working, which ſin unconfeſt did hinder. To deny penitents, where there is any fair and poſſible hopes, by reaſon of conviction wrought, is their ſad diſcouragement; we ſee them lame, and weak, and we deny them a Crutch that is provided for them. And to receive obſti-

nate ones, that without remorſe carry it on in wickedneſſe, ſeems dangerouſly to ſtrengthen them in their wayes; and not at all to help them out of their ungodly courſes. From this that hath been ſpoken, a fair anſwer therefore may be given to the arguments before paſt by, concerning any power in this Ordinance for converſion. And firſt, for that from the Directory where *the ignorant, ſcandalous, and prophane that live in any ſin, or offence againſt their conſcience, are warned not to preſume to come nigh that holy Table*, it is meant of thoſe that purpoſely reſolve to hold their ſin, and doubtleſſe that purpoſe ſtanding, here is no comfort to be put into their hands. It is no other then that counſel of our Saviour, *Matth.* 5. 23, 24. *If thou bring thy gift to the Altar, and there remembreſt that thy brother hath ought againſt thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, firſt be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.* Sacraments will not be accepted from that hand, where malice is ſeated in the heart, and implacably continued; but it followes not but that where the ſoul is ſtartled, and ſuch reſolutions for ſin do not appear, this may be a means further to awake; and provoke to a reſolution againſt it. As to that of Communicating to *Heathens, Pagans*, enough hath been ſaid before, It can neither be done with allowance, nor any poſſible benefit. And for Excommunicate perſons, they are ſuppoſed to be in an obſtinate way of wickedneſſe. The laſt is onely worthy of conſideration, *That Ordinance that is not communicable nor lawfull to be adminiſtred to any known impenitent ſinner under that notion, but onely as penitent ſinners truly repenting of their ſins, is not a converting but a ſealing Ordinance: But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is not communicable nor lawfull to be adminiſtred to any known impenitent ſinner, &c. Ergo.* Here I might juſtly except againſt that oppoſition that is ſtill put between converting, and ſealing Ordinances; as though it muſt be taken for granted, that no ſealing Ordinance could have any hand in, or towards converſion. Gods ſeal added to his promiſe, may by the bleſſing of God be ſerviceable here, as well as his oath, added for confirmation; but this is grounded upon the miſtake of the way of the Sacraments ſealing, in which I have ſufficiently expreſſed my ſelf. For anſwer to the Argument it ſelf, The *major* Propoſition is not true, unleſſe it be underſtood with juſt limitation; Reproof is an Ordinance that may well be reckoned among

thoſe

thoſe that work to converſion, being *the way of life*, Prov. 6. 23. and called *the reproof of life*, Prov. 13. 31. *an excellent oyl*, Pſal. 141. 5. and upon that account to be uſed towards a brother in ſin, *Levit.* 19. 17. And yet prudence muſt be uſed in the application of it. Every man is not a meet ſubject to get good by it. There is no ſuch warineſſe explicitely required in the diſpenſing of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, as there is in the application of reproofs; nor yet any ſo punctually pointed out not to communicate, as there is not to be reproved. The Wiſemans obſervation is, that *He that reproveth a ſcorner, getteth to himſelf ſhame; and he that rebuketh a wicked man, getteth to himſelf a blot:* Therefore he gives advice upon it, ver. 8. *Reprove not a ſcorner, leſt he hate thee: rebuke a wiſe man, and he will love thee.* Every Ordinance therefore that is for converſion, is not meet to be applyed to every man in an unconverted condition: Rebukes ſet out the danger of ſin, and the Lords Supper is for the aggravation of it, in holding forth the ſad effects of it, yet neither of both meet to be applyed to all in ſin. That charge of our Saviour is delivered in an univerſal way, *Caſt not holy things to dogs, nor pearles before ſwine.* The Propoſition there included is general, Nothing that is holy, nothing that is of the honour of a pearl, is to be caſt to any dog or ſwine; whence we may aſſume: But there is no converting Ordinance, but it is of the number of holy things: *Ergo.* No converting Ordinances are to be given to any that are dogs and ſwine, which way ſoever any think to extricate themſelves, by putting limits to any term in the Propoſition, they muſt neceſſarily be brought to yield, that all converting Ordinances are not promiſcuouſly to be applyed to all in ſin; But choyce muſt be made unto whom they may with profit be delivered. And thus I have ſpoke my full thoughts of the ſubjects of this Ordinance, concluding without the leaſt heſitancy or ſcruple, That all in Covenant have a fundamental, or firſt right to it, a *jus ad rem*, and making it my buſineſſe to find out who they be that may be admitted, in expectation of benefit by it, and who are juſtly detained from it; In which I truſt I have given juſt offence on no hand, either in giving way to the admiſſion of any that according to any Scripture-rule, or juſt deduction thence ſhould be held back, and ſo hardening them in any way of ignorance or ſin, in giving them any encouragement. I have a witneſſe in heaven,

heaven, that I intended nothing in this but to find out the mind of Jesus Christ, and to have this Ordinance so administred, that the edification of the visible Members of Jesus Christ might be most promoted, and godlinesse encouraged. And in case that this which I have done, may not be serviceable this way, I desire that it may prove an abortive. I know there is a distinction used by some, and applyed to admission both of Infants to Baptisme, and men of growth to the Lords Table; that there is a twofold title, one *in foro Dei, in the Court of Heaven*, and here onely the Infants of the elect regenerate have title (as they say) to Baptisme, and the elect regenerate themselves to the Lords Supper. The other *in foro Ecclesiastico, in the Court of the Church*, and here all the Infants of professed believers have right in Baptisme, and the knowing and not scandalous, though unregenerate, to the Lords Supper. By the favour of which distinction, those of that judgment and I may be well enough agreed; and as I think there is small difference about the persons to be admitted to this Supper, yet for the distinction, I confesse I do not understand it: Both the Sacraments being Church-Ordinances, I suppose God keeps no other Court about them, save the Court of his Church. If they have this right *in foro Ecclesiastico*, then it is the mind of God that the Church should admit them, and so they have right *in foro Dei* likewise. And I marvel how those that bring this within the power of jurisdiction, can here apply this distinction, seeing it overthrowes that which they apply hither, *Whatsoever you bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.* Many that are admitted may want acceptance in heaven; but having their right, and putting in no visible barre, their confessed Ecclesiastical right concludes, that their admission is with acceptance of heaven; and my great businesse hath been for their comfort and encouragement that give admittance, that their benefiting is possible that are thus admitted. And here I might take into consideration the opinion of those that would have a promiscuous admittance, and indeed I had it in my thoughts to have given a brief answer to Mr. *Humphrey's* Scriptures, and Reasons, so much by some applauded, and so strongly bottomed, Because all Communicants must drink of the Cup, therefore all must communicate, with some limits, which being yielded, as I have proved they must, will draw the limit necessa-

neceſſarily, yet ſomewhat more narrow. But this is by one hand already done, and I have lately had the happineſſe to ſee a ſecond learned Piece fitted for the Preſſe; dealing largely in it, which I doubt not may both ſatisfie the Adverſary and the Reader, ſo that my pains may well be ſpared; onely I cannot but take notice of his fourth Reaſon for a promiſcuous admiſſion, which he ſaith will ariſe from the *vanity, formality, impoſſibility of ſelecting people to this Ordinance: Look up but to the heart of all theſe ſeparations, they come to nothing: For put the caſe you will have a gathered company, I pray who do you account indeed to be fit and worthy receivers? If not all that make profeſſion, as we do mixtly, then thoſe onely that have an intereſt in Chriſt, and are true believers. Well, but how will you be able to know them? The heart of man is deceitfull above all things; who can know it? And if we can hardly diſcover our own hearts, how ſhall we diſcern others? ſo that all will come, but to thoſe that have the faireſt ſhew, thoſe that ſeem ſuch, and you cannot be ſecured, but there may, and will be ſome hypocrites; and ſo this true partaking as all one body, and one blood, in ſuch an unmixt communion, as you pretend, vaniſhes, and there can be no ſuch matter: But now if men ſtand here upon a formal purity, and will have the outward pureſt Church they can, they go to ſeparating again, and never leave ſeparating and ſeparating, (as we have daily teſtimony) till they are quite ſeparated one from another; Even as in the peeling of an Onion, where you may peel, and peel, till you have brought all to nothing, unleſſe to a few tears perchance, with which the eyes of good men muſt needs run over in the doing.* To this I anſwer, If the rule to take in this gathered company, be intereſt in Chriſt, to take in thoſe of a ſaving intereſt, and refuſe all others, if regenerate, then he ſhall be admitted; in caſe unregenerate, then he ſhall be refuſed; then I ſhall yield his concluſion, I ſhall leave that diſtinction to him, that knowes what is in man. I ſhould fear many a man of non-intereſt might be let in, and many a man of true intereſt refuſed; a glozing tongue may here carry it, further then an upright heart. And for his next of a formal purity, to get the Church as pure as we can; though this ought to be our endeavour, to get the Church as pure, not formally, but really, as poſſible; yet I make it no rule: But following the Apoſtles rule, to do, as all things elſe, ſo this, to edification; though it be a matter of much care and prudence, yet not vain and impoſſible

in

in a good measure, to determine it: upon this rule I pitch, till I hear something that may take me off it.

SECT. XVI.

An enquiry into the power authorized to judge of mens meetnesse for the Lords Supper.

THe adæquate subject of Sacraments being found out, and some discovery made of those, that according to Scripture principles stand in a present aptitude for actual admission; A great question yet remains, Who must judge of this fitnesse, so as to approve of men as such, and Authoritatively to refuse, or passe by others; in which we may seem to be much in the dark, finding no one expressely set up for that work, nor any Scripture-precedent of any that have taken upon themselves such power. And herein men have been very different in their thoughts; The Church of *England* heretofore hath vested the Minister in sole power, as appears in Canon 26. which provides, *That no Minister shall in any wise admit to the receiving of the holy communion, any of his cure or flock, which be openly known to live in sin, notorious without repentance, nor any who have maliciously and openly contended with their neighbours, untill they shall be reconciled.* As also the Rubrick to the same purpose. It is true that those that made it their businesse to screw up Episcopal power to that height that it could not bear, did interpret this of such notorious offenders, that by the Ordinary had been so adjudged, and under present censure, expressely contrary to the very words of Canon 27. requiring *every Minister so repelling any such upon complaint, or being required by the Ordinary to signifie the cause unto him and therein obey his direction;* In case of such a preceding censure upon the person thus refused, he had beforehand his direction, and complaint is then supposed to be made onely for his obedience, in refusing those that according to command given, were to be denied. The Schoolmen generally go this way, putting the sole power into the hands of a Minister, not so much disputing it, (so farre as I have read) as taking it for granted. *Suarez* putting it to the question, [a] *Whether the Ministers of this Sacrament are bound not to give it to a man in mortal sinne?* answers,

Who are to judge of mens present aptitude.

The various claimes that are made to this power.

[a] Utrum teneantur Ministri hujus Sacramenti non dare illud homini existenti in peccato mortali?

answers, [b] That *they are simply and absolutely under such an obligation*, mentioning none that are over them, or assistent to them in it. And in his first reason he saith, That [c] *this obligation doth arise from natural and divine Law, an institution of the Sacrament being supposed, and such commission given to the Ministers*; so that he doth no more question the Ministers authority in this thing, then he doth the institution of the Sacrament it self, *Suarez* in tertiam partem Thomæ, quæst. 89. disput. 67. sect. 1. And *Thomas* puts the question [d] *whether a Priest ought to give the body of Christ to a sinner* seeking it? *part. tertia*, quæst. 80. Art. 6 without mention of any other in power for it. The Fathers were also of the same judgement, we need not quote testimonies from them, of exclusion of men from the Sacraments, he that will be furnished, let him read Mr. *Gillespy Aarons rod*, lib. 3. cap. 17. And we read of no other joyned with the Minister for that work. *Dionysius Areopagita*, who is reckoned amongst ancient Writers, though not of that standing to be *Pauls* Scholar, *Hierarch.* Eccles. cap. 3. pag. 3 having spoken of those that were possest with Devills and tormented, called *Energumeni*, and of flagitious persons, saith, [e] *Let these therefore first, and much rather then the other, be separated by the voice and office of the Minister.* It was then accounted to be his office, to see to that work. That of *Chrysostome* frequently quoted for exclusion of scandalous persons from this Supper speaks fully to the power of dispensers for it, Homil. 83. in *Matth.* *Let no cruel one, no unmerciful one, none any way impure, come unto it. I speak these things to you that do receive. and also to you that do administer, even to you this is necessary to be told, that with great care and heedfulnesse you distribute these gifts: there doth no small punishment abide you, if you permit any to partake of this Table, whose wickednesse you know, for his blood shall be required at your hands.* Other reformed Churches place, for the greater part, this power in the Eldership, preaching and ruling Elders joyned together in Consistory. Those of the independant Congregational way, judge it meet, that the whole Church, even all the body of the faithful, should have their vote in it. The best way for the discovery of truth, is to hear what each part have to say for themselves, and then to examine

[b] respondetur certum esse habere Ministros hujus Sacramenti hanc obligationem simpliciter & absolute loquendo.

[c] Ex quibus sequitur primo, hanc obligationem oriri ex ipsa lege naturali ac divina supposita tali Sacramenti institutione, & potestate ac munere commisso Sacerdotibus.

[d] Utrum Sacerdos debeat denegare corpus Christi peccatori petenti?

[e] Primi igitur isti & quidem rectius quam illi Ministri officio & voce separentur.

examine proofs brought, together with inconveniencies that may be objected, and are like to follow from any one of theſe, by whom power is claimed: and laſtly, to pitch upon that which we judge to be moſt ſuitable to Scripture, and to anſwer the inconvenences charged upon it. For that party that can ſpeak moſt of reaſon according to Scripture-rule, and whoſe way is followed with feweſt inconveniences, may in all reaſon lay the faireſt claim to it. But to do this throughly, were an endleſſe labour, in which we might take in the whole diſpute about Church Government, which would be an outlet, farre bigger then this whole work. Thoſe that veſt the Paſtor in this power, ſay,

Allegations for a Miniſters ſole power.

1. He is the ſteward of the Myſteries of God, 2 *Cor.* 4. 1. And as ſtewards in great families, have the care of ordering the food of the whole houſehold: ſo they being called to this honour, are to have the like power in the Church of God.

2. They alone are to diſpenſe this ordinance, as upon a manifold account may be made good, and in due place (God willing) ſhall be ſpoken to.

3. The adminiſtration of Sacraments belongs to the power of order, wherewith Miniſters are ſolely veſted, and not to juriſdiction, as is granted; and therefore his prudence muſt guide him in diſcerning the parties that are to partake of it. A faithful and wiſe ſteward, diſcerns the ſeaſon when to give portions of meat to the houſehold, *Luk.* 12. 42. as alſo the perſons to whom he is to impart it. This learned Mr. *Jeans* ſaith, is the opinion of the Schoolmen, though he is pleaſed to ſay, *They are extreamly out in it, in denying the debarring from the Sacrament of the Lords Supper to notorious offenders, to be an act of juriſdiction; and and ſo they* (ſaith he) *put it into the hands and power of a Miniſter to deny it thoſe that he judgeth to be groſſe and ſcandalous ſinners.* *pag.* 46. quoting a full and pertinent paſſage out of *Suarez*, in tertiam partem Thomæ. tom. 3. diſput. 67. Sect. 3. *This diſpenſation, or denyal of the Sacrament, is no judicial act, or impoſition of a penalty; but onely a prudent and faithful adminiſtration of it, and therefore doth not depend on witneſſes or proofs, but onely on ſuch*

o

Hæc diſpenſatio vel denegatio Sacramenti non eſt conſideranda, ut actio judicialis, vel inflictiva pœnæ, ſed ſolum, ut prudens ac fidelis adminiſtratio Sacramenti; & ideo non pendet ex teſtibus aut probationibus, ſed ſolum ex ea Scientia & cognitione quæ prudenti exiſtimatione ſecundum occurrentes circumſtantias judicatur ſufficiens ut ſine incommodo poſſit, & debeat negari Sacramentum.

a knowledg and underſtanding of the thing; which by a prudential eſtimate according to emergent circumſtances may be judged ſufficient that without any inconvenience the Sacrament may be denied.

4. If this power be denyed to a Miniſter, many times it ſo falls out, that of neceſſity, either the adminiſtration of the Sacrament muſt be wholly ſuſpended, (which ſome of reverend worth have largely ſhewed to be of dangerous conſequence) or elſe the Miniſter muſt be neceſſitated to diſpenſe it to thoſe that are moſt unfit to partake of it. In abundance of places no ſuch power of juriſdiction is ſet up, nor can be expected, and food is neceſſary when we want a rod.

Allegations for the power of an Elderſhip.

Thoſe that contend for the Elderſhips power in it, affirming that it belong to them and no other; Firſt, diſtinguiſh of the adminiſtration of the Sacrament, and admiſſion to it; confeſſing that adminiſtration belongs to the power of order; but admiſſion, as they ſay, belongs to juriſdiction. Now juriſdiction is in Elders, together with the Paſtor, not ſo narrow, as to be ſeated ſolely in the Paſtor; nor ſo large, as to take in all the people. Secondly, They diſpute largely from the inconveniences that will follow, in caſe it be left ſolely in the hands of the Miniſter, or put promiſcuouſly into the hands of the people; and therefore to avoid both of theſe extreams, they veſt the whole Elderſhip, and onely the Elderſhip in power with it.

Allegations for the power of the people.

Thoſe that plead for the power of the people, ſay; Firſt, that they muſt in duty avoid ſuch in their converſe, that are thus under cenſure; and therefore are to have a hand in, and to be called to counſel about it. Secondly, That in excommunication the people are to have a hand, (we find the Apoſtles direction for it, 1 *Cor.* 5. 4.) and conſequently in ſuſpenſion, and ſo they conclude, that the power is in all the faithful. I muſt freely profeſſe, that the firſt of theſe (which hath been longeſt in uſe) takes moſt with my judgement, as that which hath moſt ſtrength of reaſon for it, and attended (for ought I can yet ſee) with leaſt inconveniences. In which (I ſuppoſe) I ſhould yet have concealed my ſelf, had not the preſent juncture of time, and ſtate of things, put ſome neceſſity upon me (treating of theſe things) to ſpeak my thoughts. Were Elderſhips in Congragations ſetled in their deſired power, and that order ſet up, and accordingly followed, I ſhould ſo have prized the peace of the Church, as not

to

to have caſt any bone of contention in a buſineſſe of this nature ſo diſputable; and where an error of that hand is, of no ſo great danger. As I have without ſcruple acted in that way, ſo I am not willing to caſt ſcruples into the thoughts of any; my reaſons will afterwards ſufficiently appear: But things being in that poſture as now they are, and for ought is ſeen, like enough to continue; Sacraments muſt be wholly diſcontinued, or an abſolute promiſcuous liberty granted to any man, woman, or child, to receive it; unleſſe it may appear that the Paſtor according to prudence may manage it. I ſhall therefore endeavour, 1. To ſatisfie the claimes that are made on the contrary for other intereſts. 2. I ſhall give anſwer to the objections brought againſt a Miniſters ſole and ſingle power. 3. I ſhall limit this Doctrine with ſome needfull cautions to avoid miſtake. Firſt, I muſt ſpeak to them that ſay, power is committed of Jeſus *non uni, ſed unitati*; not to any ſingle preaching Elder or Paſtor, but to an Elderſhip; preaching and ruling Elders joyned together, for which (excepting the arguments drawn from the inconveniencies of placing it onely in one) this is the ſumme of all that I find ſpoken; *That the power of Diſcipline is given by Chriſt, not to one Elder, but to the united company of Elders; and for one Miniſter to aſſume this power to himſelf, is to make himſelf the Church; it is to make himſelf a Congregational Pope: It is a bringing in of a power into the Church, that would have ſome reſemblance* (as is objected) *to auricular confeſſion.* This argument takes that for granted which is moſt in queſtion, (and that which Mr. *Jeans* ſaith, the Schoolmen do deny, that this is an act of juriſdiction,) and belongs to the power of Diſcipline; and this being barely affirmed, or rather onely ſuppoſed, it may be as eaſily denyed. But I would give ſome reaſons of my denyal of it, and then the whole of the argument falls.

A'legations for the power of an Elderſhip taken into conſideration.

Firſt, This power of juriſdiction ſuppoſed to be in the whole Elderſhip, is either reſpective to the whole buſineſſe of the Sacrament, or elſe ſolely to the admiſſion or refuſal of men for participation of it. If it reſpect the whole work, then thoſe that are not commiſſioned to preach Goſpel-promiſes, may yet apply Covenant-ſeales. They that have no call to open and ſhew forth the Myſtery, have authority to diſpenſe the Elements, which is againſt the judgement of the Learned of this opinion: If it barely reſpect admiſſion, and not adminiſtration, then (unleſſe

Reaſons evincing that admiſſion to the Lords Supper is no act of juriſdiction. *Reaſon* 1.

leſſe we had expreſſely the mind of Chriſt to the contrary) it will appear to be the greateſt of ſoloeciſms, to give a man commiſſion for a work, and then to leave him to the courteſie of others, not otherwiſe intereſted in it, for the exerciſe of it. There did a complaint lye againſt Biſhops, giving commiſſion in Ordination large enough to preach the Goſpel; yet afterwards would not ſuffer it, without a licenſe from their Courts to be put into action. This at the firſt ſight looks much like it; when Miniſters ſhall receive power of order, which comprizes Word and Sacrament: the Goſpel with the ſeal; yet may not act in it, without an Eldership to overſee it, who as to adminiſtration are wholly Heterogeneous.

Reaſon 2. Secondly, If no other Miniſterial act, is to be preregulated (as I may ſay) by any power of Diſcipline, or the exerciſe of it to be ſuſpended, till they know the pleaſure of men in juridick place and power, then there is no reaſon ſingly and ſingularly to ſubject this of Sacramental adminiſtration to it. This propoſition hath all reaſon in it; But there is no other Miniſterial act that is to be thus preregulated, or the exerciſe of it thus ſuſpended; *Ergo* there is no reaſon ſingly and ſingularly to ſubject this of Sacramental adminiſtration to it.

Reaſon 3. Thirdly, If the diſpenſation of the promiſes be committed to the Miniſterial prudence of the diſpenſers, without any juriſdiction put upon them, or any other in a way of juriſdiction aſſociated with them, then there is no reaſon to be given but that they may according to Chriſtian prudence, in like manner diſpenſe the ſeales, without any ſuch juriſdiction or aſſociation. This I ſee not how any can deny, ſeeing the promiſes are delivered upon the ſame termes as the ſeales: But the diſpenſation of the promiſes is committed to their Miniſterial prudence, and no other aſſociated in juriſdiction with them; This cannot be denyed. It followes then, that according to Chriſtian prudence, they may diſpenſe the ſeals, without any aſſociated in any juriſdiction with them. If any ſhould object, that it will follow from hence, that the Sacraments are to be delivered unto all, to whom the promiſes are tendered; This I ſhall grant with theſe three limits. 1. That thoſe to whom they are tendered, profeſſedly accept them, otherwiſe the Sacraments may be delivered to Heathens. 2. That there be ſome competency of underſtanding of them, otherwiſe the moſt ignorant of the Catechu-

meni

meni were not onely to come to Baptiſme, but to the Lords Supper. 3. That they do not openly and reſolvedly in their courſe of life go againſt their engagements in them. In ſuch caſe the promiſe may be tendered to Heathens, to groſſely ignorant and flagitious ones, and yet the ſeal for preſent upon theſe grounds withheld.

Fourthly, Where power for any work is committed to one, and no other named to be imployed with him, there the work is left to the ſole care and prudence of him to whom it is committed, and not by power of juriſdiction veſted in many: But the work of adminiſtration of Sacraments is committed to one, and no other named to whom it is committed. The Propoſition cannot be denyed, and I know not how the Aſſumption can be anſwered. The concluſion then followes. *Reaſon 4.*

Fifthly, If Miniſters have not onely been veſted with power for adminiſtration, but actually alſo have adminiſtred with approbation, without any juriſdiction, then it is no act of juriſdiction. This cannot be denyed, ſeeing that if it were the mind of Chriſt that a juriſdiction ſhould be ſet up for adminiſtration, then the diſpenſers muſt have ſtayed for it (as *Saul* ought to have done for *Samuel*) before adminiſtration: But Miniſters have not onely been in power for adminiſtration of Sacraments, but have actually adminiſtred with approbation without any juriſdiction: They have done it in unofficed Churches, where no juriſdiction had place; this is evident. To ſay nothing of *Johns* Baptiſme, inſtance might be given in the baptiſme adminiſtred by Chriſts Diſciples; we find the Eunuch, the Jayler, and others baptized, and no Elderſhip conſulted. Chriſt delivered the Lords Supper where no Elderſhip was ſet up; and in caſe, *Act.* 2. 42. be underſtood of the Lords Supper, (as is generally conceived) there can be no contradiction; ſeeing that it is not imaginable that as yet that order was eſtabliſhed with them. *Reaſon 5.*

If any ſhall object, that a command lay upon them to adminiſter the Sacraments, which muſt in this caſe of neceſſity be obeyed, and the duty not neglected, though an Elderſhip for a more orderly and regular carriage be wanting. *Object.*

To this I anſwer, Omiſſions ſeem better to me then a prohibited, or a diſorderly proceeding, expreſſely againſt a Command, or Ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt; The Arke had better ſtayed where it was, then a new Cart ſhould have carried it in that diſorder to *Sol.*

to the place appointed for it: Better that *Saul* and *Vzziah* had let ſacrifice a lone, then any to whom it did not appertain, ſhould have undertaken it. This therefore with me is not cogent, unleſſe it be confeſt, that there is no precept reſpective to ſuch juriſdiction, when there is a command for adminiſtration. I never ſaw ſufficient reaſon given, that a man ſhould break an expreſſe rule given in Command from God, rather then omit a duty of meer poſitive inſtitution: *Jeroboam* muſt rather have no ſacrifice then that *Dan* or *Bethel* ſhould be the place for it: And in caſe ſuch neceſſity may diſpenſe with irregularities, why may we not on the other hand be irregular? and in ſuch neceſſary want of a full and compleat order, the Miniſter who is one, and the firſt in the number of ſuch an Elderſhip, to take upon him the whole work, rather then on the one hand the adminiſtration ſhould wholly ceaſe, or on the other hand promiſcuouſly diſpenſed, where there can be no poſſible benefit received. To this I confeſſe, I was for ſome time much inclined, till that upon further examination and debate, reaſon enforced me to conclude, that the Miniſter by Divine appointment is authoritatively himſelf veſted in power for a dmiſſion or denyal. And if I be driven out of this, and all theſe arguments here laid down fully ſatisfied, I ſhall rather believe that the Miniſter who is one party in the power pleaded for, as before, may rather act alone in ſuch neceſſity, then either the authority it ſelf be wholly laid aſide, or Sacraments totally diſcontinued.

Object. If any ſhall further object, That Chriſt and his Apoſtles had virtually all offices in them, ſo that if that order could not ſo ſoon be eſtabliſhed among them; the defect in this impoſſible caſe was ſufficiently ſupplyed by the Apoſtolical Office.

Sol. I anſwer, What power ſoever was veſted in them, yet it appears not, that at once they exerciſed the power of all of them, but acted orderly in an aſſociation when it was required. *Paul* Ordained *Timothy* by laying on of hands, but not alone, but as aſſociated in a Presbytery, his hands were laid upon him, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. and the hands of the Presbytery were laid upon him, 1 *Tim.* 4. 4. He ordered the inceſtuous *Corinthians* excommunication; but this he did not alone, but with the Church-Officers, 1 *Cor.* 5. And if the Apoſtles Office had virtually all in it, yet it may be queſtioned whether it were ſo with *Philip*, unleſſe we can make it good (which is by few believed) that he was *Philip* the Apoſtle.

Sixthly,

Sixthly, That which hath neither any law in Scripture for it, nor any ſet up for execution of it, is no Church-cenſure to be proceeded in, by vertue of juriſdiction; This is plain: But in Scripture there is no Law enacted for proceeding in ſuch a cenſure, nor men ſet up for to proceed in ſuch a juridick way; Therefore it followes that this is no Church-Cenſure. If any ſay, The Keys imply this power, and thoſe that receive the keys, are ſet up in power; I anſwer, That Sacraments are within the power of order, which is diſtinct from juriſdiction, and contains no cenſure; and Keys in juriſdiction imply a letting in, and ſhutting out: now this is a Cenſure of thoſe that remain within, and neither ſerves for letting in, nor excluſion. *Reaſ.* 6.

7thly, If thoſe muſt be kept back from the Sacrament in a prudential way, on whom no ſentence in way of juriſdiction ought to paſs, then this rather belongs to prudence then to juriſdiction; This is plain: But thoſe are to be kept back on whom no ſentence in a way of juriſdiction ought to paſs; This is alſo plain, Juriſdiction for cenſure is not, but in caſe of crime, & many are detained upon defect in judgment, no criminal charge being laid againſt them: *Ergo.* *Reaſ.* 7.

Eighthly, The detaining of that from, or denyal of it to any, which they cannot improve for their benefit, but viſibly tends to their danger, is no juridick act of penalty, but a prudential care for his advantage from whom it is thus detained, and to whom it is thus denyed; This is clear. To deny drink to an Hydropick perſon, or fleſh-meats to one in a Feaver, garlick or onions to a wounded perſon, or full of ulcerous ſores, is not to inflict a penalty, but to exerciſe a prudential care: But this denyal of the Sacrament to, or detaining it from the ignorant, &c. is onely to withhold that which viſibly tends to danger, and cannot be improved for any advantage; Therefore it is no juridick penalty, but a buſineſſe of prudential care. And here an Objection which carries moſt colour of all that can be ſaid, is prevented, and already anſwered. To debar a man upon the grounds of ignorance, error or ſcandal from that which otherwiſe were his right, and proper intereſt, belongs to the power of juriſdiction; and is a cenſure; But in this a man for ignorance, error or ſcandal, is debarred of that which otherwiſe is his right, and therefore it belongs to the power of juriſdiction; and is a Church-Cenſure. To this upon the grounds before laid down, is anſwered, To debar a man of his right to his ſenſible prejudice, and to hold from him that which *Reaſ.* 8.

would be his preſent livelihood and comfort; is indeed a penalty or juridick cenſure; as to ſequeſter a man from his houſe and Lands, to diſfranchiſe a man of his Trade, &c. But for a Parent, a Nurſe or Phyſician, to order dyet as moſt for health, and to withdraw ſome food when digeſtion will not bear it, and it evidently appears to be of danger, is an act of prudence, and no cenſure; and ſo a Miniſter is conſidered in the adminiſtration of Word and Sacraments.

Reaſon 9. Ninthly, If admiſſion to, or excluſion from other Ordinances of eminent height and excellency, to which all are not promiſcuouſly admitted, be left to prudence, and not to the exerciſe of any juridick power, then there is no reaſon to take this out of the Miniſters hand, and put it over to any ſuch powers: But excluſion from, and admiſſion to other Ordinances of eminent height and excellency, to which all are not promiſcuouſly admitted, as private Faſts, and doubtful diſputations, *Matth.* 9. *Rom.* 14. is left to prudence, and not to the exerciſe of any juridick power: *Ergo.*

Reaſon 10. Laſtly, If this be an act of juriſdiction to admit to the Sacrament, and keep off from it, then there muſt be a Law of Jeſus Chriſt in it, a Goſpel-Ordinance for it; This is plain: Jeſus Chriſt hath not left to his Officers an arbitrary Government, he hath left no Commiſſion to rule at pleaſure: as they are to ſpeak, ſo they are to act according to his will, and pleaſure known: But no ſuch Law, no ſuch Ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt is found in Scriptures. A command we have in the Goſpel for adminiſtration of Sacraments, as well Baptiſme as the Lords Supper; and Covenant-intereſt is our Directory (as you have heard) to lead us to thoſe that have fundamental intereſt in them: But concerning excluſion of any thus enrighted, there is nothing by way of Ordinance written: Therefore this can be no act of juriſdiction. The Aſſumption is that which many will queſtion; It lyes upon them then to quote this Law, to make known this Ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt: But inſtead of that, I ſhall ſhew upon what grounds it yet appears to me that there is none at all. If any ſuch be, it is either in plain, and full words expreſt, ſuch as the Law given to *Iſrael*, to *put out of the Camp every leper, and every one that hath an iſſue, or is defiled by the dead*, Numb. 5. 1, 2. or elſe it muſt be ſuch as is deduced by fair conſequence from the nature and uſe of the Sacrament, or preparation to it, or benefit received by it; That there

there is no Ordinance in ſuch plain, full words, needs not to be doubted: In all that enquiry into this ſo much controverted buſineſſe, it would have been long ſince produced. In caſe it be deduced from any ſuch conſequence as hath been ſpoken, it will hardly be made good to be an inſtituted Law, or conſtituted Ordinance. Mr. *Firmin* hath well excepted againſt the proof of inſtitutions by ſyllogiſmes, though to his great diſadvantage, in that diſpute of a Church-Covenant. Where there is an Ordinance in power, (as there was for excluſion from the Paſſeover) proof may be made up by conſequence for the latitude, to diſcern who thoſe be that are within the verge of it, and concerned in it. But conſequences will hardly prove the enacting, and inſtituting of it: I ſhall be willing to gratifie Mr. *Tombs* in this, that parity of reaſon will ſet up no inſtitution. A good cauſe is wronged, when Ordinances of this nature are pretended, and cannot be produced; and on the other hand, when a Miniſteriall prudence in the Stewards of Chriſt is undervalued, which might ſupply it. Let it be granted, that there is no Ordinance to debar an unexcommunicated man from the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, yet a promiſcuous admiſſion will not follow; when the end and uſe of the Sacrament is conſidered, it will appear to them that have the care and charge about it, that ſome are not in a preſent aptitude for it. There is a command for the preaching of the Word in a way to edification, 1 *Cor.* 14.3,12. yet the particular way of application ſuitable to mens capacities, ſo as to give milk to babes and children, and ſtrong meat to thoſe of growth, that have their ſenſes exerciſed, to diſcern between good and evil, is not done by any vertue of any ſpecifick particular inſtitution, but the Miniſters prudence: Which prudence was exerciſed by *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 1, 2. *Heb.* 5. 12. by Chriſt himſelf, *Joh.* 16. 12. There is no Ordinance for admiſſion to, or excluſion from private Faſts, or punctual direction, who are to be called, and received, or who paſt by; yet our Saviour Chriſt from the high nature of the duty, concludes that it is not for novices in the faith. And as it is a point of prudence, not to put a piece of new cloth in an old garment, (unwrought cloth ſome underſtand) there will be a double inconvenience, the weakneſſe of the one will not bear the ſtrength of the other, and ſo the rent that was before will be made greater, and the whole garment become uncomely and unſuitable; nor yet to put new wine (which

is windy, and working) into old bottles, the weakneſſe of ſuch a veſſel being not able to bear it: ſo neither had it been a point of prudence in our Saviour Chriſt, to have put ſuch an auſtere diſcipline upon the necks of his newly entred diſciples.

Matth. 7. 6. vindicated.

If any ſhall object that Text, *Matth.* 7. 6. *Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither caſt ye pearles before ſwine*, as I know it is produced as an Ordinance for the withholding of this Sacrament from thoſe that are ignorant, and ſcandalous; I ſhall deſire the Reader, for anſwer, to take it into conſideration, whether it be not more agreeable to the Text, to make it an exhortation to an holy prudential circumſpection in the diſpenſation of holy things in general, (whether in a private, or a publick way) then to make it a diſtinct peculiar Ordinance about any one piece or part of worſhip. Making it a peculiar Ordinance, we ſhall run our ſelves upon inextricable difficulties: Our Saviour laying it down in an indefinite way, All whatſoever that is holy, muſt there be underſtood; and pearles, and holy things are the ſame, one being exegetical of the other; holy things excelling other things, as far as pearles excel acorns. And by doggs and ſwine, both which were unclean in the Law, we muſt underſtand all that Scripture comprehends under thoſe names; they are both put for one, 2 *Pet.* 1. 21. and ſo the reſult of all is, that no perſon in viſible uncleanneſſe muſt taſte of any thing that is holy. From which it followes, that as Chriſt thought it not fit at that preſent to gratifie a Heathen with a miracle, when he ſaid, *It is not meet to take the childrens bread, and caſt it unto doggs*, Matth. 15. 26. So it will at no time be meet, or lawfull to preach the Goſpel to any heathen, or impenitent and unclean Chriſtian, they being no other then dogs or ſwine, and the Goſpel the moſt precious of holy pearles; but underſtanding it as an exhortation to Chriſtian prudence, and obſerving the reaſon added, leſt they trample them under feet, and turn again and rent you, theſe abſurdities and ſnares will be avoided; and the reſult of all will be onely this, that the holy things of God, and rich Goſpel-pearles, are not to be communicated, where there is no poſſible expectation of doing good: But all the iſſue of it will evidently be danger to him that doth impart them, and all ſcorn and contempt of the holy things themſelves; which was the Apoſtles way of dealing, when the Jewes were filled with envy, contradicting and blaſpheming, *Act.* 13. and is frequently

quently given in counſel by the Wiſe man, *Rebuke not a ſcorner, leſt he hate thee: He that rebuketh a ſcorner, getteth to himſelf a blot*, Prov. 9. 7. And the words being thus underſtood, though the Sacrament be not ſolely intended, yet it is not wholly excluded, being of the number of thoſe holy things, about which there ſhould be all Chriſtian prudence.

1 Cor. 5. 11. vindicated.

That Text alſo, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. is produced by ſome, as holding out an Ordinance for ſuſpenſion from the Lords Supper, *But now I have written unto you, not to keep company. If any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with ſuch an one no not to eat.* But it is more then ſtrange, that when the Apoſtle ſpeaks not at all of the Lords Supper in that Chapter, that he ſhould in thoſe words (in ſuch a ſort delivered) make an Ordinance about it. And it is clear in the Text, that the Apoſtle gives direction about the common courſe of our life, to ſhun all voluntary and free converſe, out of choyce for that end which he ſpecifies, 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 14. *And if any man obey not our word by this Epiſtle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be aſhamed.* I will not ſtand to diſpute any conſequence that may be drawn from civil commerce to that which is religious, ſeeing (as I have ſaid) conſequences will not bear any inſtitution, or new ſetting up of Ordinances; and here I know there can be none at all, ſeeing this which the Apoſtle forbids, or rather from which he diſſwades, is in our own choyce, where we may forbear; and that at the Lords Table is of neceſſity, where we muſt obey; we are not to forbear our duty, though another that ſhould be kept back doth obtrude himſelf. If thoſe, *Numb.* 9. which were defiled by a dead body, had come in their uncleanneſſe unto the Paſſeover, as thoſe of *Iſſachar* and *Zebulun* did, 2 *Chr.* 7. 30. others for their ſakes ſhould not have kept abſent. Neither of theſe Texts therefore hold forth an Ordinance, but both of them Chriſtian prudence: one of them reſpecting things civil, the other that which is ſacred and religious. Thus I ſuppoſe that argument is taken off which is drawn from a ſuppoſition, that admiſſion to the Sacrament is an act of juriſdiction, in which I have been large, ſeeing I well know that many are of a different judgment. If any can produce reaſons of more ſtrength on the other hand, I ſhall be ready to yield. In the mean ſpace theſe with me are cogent, and

force

force me to conclude, That this in queſtion is an act *prudentiall*, not *juridicall*.

Inconveniences objected againſt the ſole power of the Miniſter.

As for the Objections that are brought from the inconveniences following from a Miniſters ſole and ſingle power in this action;

Object. 1. 1. That before mentioned, that to put the Miniſter into any ſuch power, is to ſet him up as a Congregational Pope, is already anſwered, in denying it to be any act of juriſdiction, and many other things will difference him from any Lordly or Pope-like rule: 1. He may erre. In his adminiſtrations he is not infallible. 2. He may be call'd to queſtion upon mal-adminiſtration, and by an authoritative juridick determination be ordered to reform. If a Miniſter Pope it in all that he doth alone, he will be found Pope-like in many things that he doth according to the mind of Chriſt Jeſus.

Object. 2. 2. As to the other that hath been mentioned, that it hath ſome reſemblance of auricular confeſſion; This reſemblance will be found to have very much diſſimilitude in it. We enquire after knowledge in the myſtery of Chriſt, and not acknowledgment of ſin. We declare to men known crimes, and do not adjure any by way of whiſper to make them known. Interlocutory Catechiſmes that are by queſtion, and anſwer, may be called by that name, as well as this practice.

Object. 3. 3. Whereas it is ſaid, It is for one man to make himſelf the Church, it is a miſtake: It is no more then to make himſelf a ſteward in the Church; that is, to act in his own perſon, as a ſteward ſet in the Church by Chriſt Jeſus.

Object. 4. 4. Men would not put their lands, nay, their goods and cattel into the hands of any one perſon; And we cannot then think that the Lord hath put the intereſt of his people in the body and blood of Chriſt to a private diſcretion. Anſwer 1. Men are many times put to it, to put their lands, goods, and cattel to the arbitrement of one, and many judge it better to be in the hands of one, in ſuch a caſe (if of worth and place) then of many aſſociated; and have had experience of it. 2. It is not a Chriſtians intereſt in the body and blood of Chriſt, that is thus referred to the diſcretion of any. I would not put that into the hands of a general Councel; none but God is to be truſted with it: Nay it is not their intereſt in the elements, but their aptitude at preſent to partake, in which ſome muſt judge, or elſe all promiſcuouſly muſt communicate.

5. It

5. It is objected, it is like this way to go ill oftentimes with the deſerving members of the Church, and ſuch as moſt deſerve ſhall leaſt feel the ſeverity of this cenſure; wicked Miniſters would keep back whom they pleaſe. Anſwer 1. We can truſt it no where, but through corruption there will be danger, and no where ſo much as in the Congregational way; when a faction ſhall gain a plurality of votes & it becomes a Church, then all is without redreſſe, and Elderſhips oftentimes are as likely to overrule a Miniſter for corrupt proceedings, as to ballaſt, and keep him from them. 2. What freedom ſoever the bad may hope to gain from any ſingle hand, the good for the moſt part may be without fear, ſeeing that in publick adminiſtrations goodneſs ſo far overawes, and mens own reputations that diſpenſe them ſo prevaile, that they are in little danger of ſuſpenſion. 3. Such a ſuppoſed wicked Miniſter acts either where there is a government over him, to call into queſtion his irregularity; ſo that the wronged may have right upon appeal and complaint, or elſe, where there is no government at all, but each mans will may be a rule. In caſe there be ſuch a government, there is a redreſſe; and what he would willingly do, that he is kept from doing. In caſe there be none ſuch, but all diſorder prevails, then there is no more danger in his adminiſtration at pleaſure, then in his delivery of Doctrine at pleaſure; there is more fear of him from the Pulpit, then from the Communion Table. And when it is committed to his prudence to divide the Word, I ſee no reaſon but that he may divide the Bread and Cup. So that all things conſidered, I ſuppoſe it to be moſt conſonant to Scripture, that it be left to a Miniſters prudence, according to Scripture-rule to manage it. *Object. 5.*

It is further ſaid, that this is to aſſume a power without any warrant, or power from Jeſus Chriſt. No text can be produced in which any ſuch power is given. *Object. 6.*

To this I anſwer, None that would take this power from the Miniſter, can own this objection: It is of equal force againſt any other hand. Let them ſhew where any other is ſet up for it, and we will preſently yeeld it. Thoſe onely that are for promiſcuous adminiſtration, can with any pretended colour in this way object it: and to theſe I ſuppoſe enough hath been ſpoken, that it is a neceſſary reſult from that power that is given for adminiſtration of this Ordinance: All Ordinances muſt be ſo diſpenſed

Allegations for the power of the people taken into consideration.

sed, that they may profit; where profit cannot follow, there is to be no dispensation.

As to the claime of those of the Congregational way before mentioned the former failing, this falls with it: They both agree that it is an act of jurisdiction, in which one party will have all to vote, the other onely the Eldership. But when it appears that it is an act of prudence, and not of juridick censure, either of both are at losse for their interest. If these have power by their vote to let in, and keep from the Sacraments, it is either as dispensers of these Mysteries, or by vertue of a juridick power of rule and government vested in them. That it is not as dispensers, themselves will acknowledge, for they cannot in a joynt way thus administer: neither can it be by virtue of any juridick power of rule and government. In case it were granted, if all are in place of rule, where then are those that are ruled, and under government? If every member be an eye, where is the foot? The Apostle salutes the Saints, and those *that rule over* them, Heb. 13. 24. Here are no Saints but what are Rulers: *Obey them that are over you in the Lord*, saith the Apostle: these must obey one another. If these thus govern, and this be an act of their government, then no man must be admitted to the Supper, but together with it he must be vested in Church-power, and rule; None must be a member, unlesse he be a Commander: Christ's Army must have all leaders, no followers; all Commanders, no common Souldiers: by this means either worthy Communicants must be shut out, or men unfit for rule promoted, seeing every godly man that hath the spirit of sanctity, hath not presently a spirit of rule. Hence will follow, that confusion by the experience of many found, and complained of by Mr. *Blackwood*, Mr. *Firmin* and others, not to be suspected of partiality; And when they argue from their power in excommunication, to their power in barring from this Ordinance, as the antecedent is to be denyed, so the consequent is false. All the faithfull are not to decree excommunication: The meeting together mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. was not of members, but officers, there being more Congregations then one in *Corinth*, as is justly presumed, and in some Churches is undenyably proved; and therefore their members could not meet about any act of government, but officers onely. So also the consequence is false, and though excommunication were in their power, yet the power of administration of Sacraments,

craments, and mens admiſſion may be in an other hand, as a prudential act. And ſo every part of the argument is found faultie. It is true that excommunication being a juridical ſuſpenſion from all Church-Communion, and Participation in Church-priviledges, comprizes in it ſuſpenſion from the Lords Table, as he that is caſt out of the houſe, is no more ordered for his diet in the houſe, but kept from it. Yet there may be a non-adminiſtration by the Miniſter where there is not any ſuch Church-cenſure. A Chriſtian in his minority (ſuppoſe of the age of ten, or twelve years) is not upon the account of his minority to be excommunicated, yet he is not of that age, as to be admitted to the Lords Supper. And whereas it is ſaid, that it is their dutie to avoid ſuch in their converſe, that are thus denyed; I anſwer, that were it granted to be a Church-cenſure formally executed, Mr. *Rutherford* hath ſufficiently anſwered, that their duty to avoid them under cenſure, is no argument that they are to have an hand in the cenſure: But being denyed to be any formal cenſure of the Church, there needs no further anſwer, and they are to avoid them no further then the manifeſtation of their condition, according to Scripture-grounds, gives them occaſion: So they muſt avoid children, youth and all others that are not competently inſtructed in Goſpel-wayes, and (according to the principles of many of them) all thoſe that are not highly verſ'd in Chriſtian Myſteries. And as for crimes that carry the name of ſcandal, the Miniſter is in a publick way to debar none, but upon known manifeſt evidences openly ſeen; of which any may be competent witneſſes. And in caſe they ſuffer wrong by the Miniſters imprudence or otherwiſe, they are not to ſuffer farther by other mens avoiding their ſociety, and communion. The community of the faithful therefore having no power of juridick cenſure, they have no colour of claime to it under any ſuch a notion. And being no formal cenſure, Elderſhips that have that power, are not formally *qua* rulers veſted in it. It therefore remains, that it is an act of *prudence* in the diſpenſer, and no act of *juriſdiction* in them that have right of cenſure, or inflicting of penalty.

Some cautions are here needful for a right underſtanding and to avoid miſtakes in that which hath been delivered.

Cautions to be obſerved in theſe proceedings.

Cauti. 1.

1. This which hath been ſpoken, muſt not any way be underſtood

ſtood to be prejudicial to Church government, or the power of Church cenſure. For though Governours are not to be conſulted before theſe ſeals be diſpenſ'd, yet government ſtill ſtands in due power notwithſtanding; of this we have all cauſe to be tender, ſeeing whileſt ſome diſpute in what hand to place it, others take their advantage quite to aboliſh it: But that Scripture ſpeaks of a Government diſtinct from that which is in the hands of civil powers, is a truth that carries ſuch evidence, that it can with no colour of truth be oppoſed. As the Romans divided that ſtate into *Senatum populumque Romanum*, implying that ſome were in power of Governing, and others were to yield ſubjection; the Spirit of God himſelf makes like diviſion of the ſtate of *Iſrael* into Elders and people, *Ruth.* 4. 9. So the Apoſtle to the *Hebr.* in like ſort diſtinguiſheth Chriſtians: *Salute the Saints and thoſe that rule over you*, Hebr. 13. 24. Some were without any power for rule, and theſe are ſtyled Saints without any further addition; others are in power for Government, and theſe have their juſt title given them. The ſame title that is given to *Cyrenius* in *Syria*, to *Pilate* in *Judea*, Luke 2. 2. Luke 3. 1. is given by the Apoſtle to theſe here mentioned. *A military or politicall word* (ſaith one) *which is ſpoken of a publick perſon who is poſſeſt of power either in Common Wealth, or Army.* And if thoſe other texts of the Apoſtle be conſulted, *Hebr.* 13. 17. 1 Tim. 5. 17. 1 Tim. 5. 19. 2 Cor. 2. 6. and 5. 12, 13. 1 Theſ. 5. 12. (to mention no more) ſo much will eaſily be found in them, that ſpeaks a government within the Church it ſelf, not going out of its own limits. Whether ſome texts ordinarily produced hold out ſo large an enumeration, as is by ſome bottom'd upon them, may happily be diſputed; but that there ſhould not ſo much as any government at all be ſpoken to cannot be imagined: which thing in reaſon is alſo plain. 1. The Church is a ſociety, a viſible Kingdom, an incorporation, a body, and when all of theſe have their lawes, governours, cenſures, puniſhments, it cannot be thought that this ſociety ſhould herein ſo farre differ, and be ſo farre inferiour to all other ſocieties, as to be wholly deſtitute: when all others enjoy government, governours, for their ſtrength. defence and more compleat being, the Church alone ſhall be like that City which the Wiſe man ſpeaks of, broken down, and without walls, *Prov.* 25. 28. 2. The Church conſiſts of men, as do other ſocieties ſubject to failings,

lings, yea, to enormities, and exorbitances in judgement and practice. There hath no age paſt in which the Church hath not had her ſchiſms, errors, and ſcandals. No ſociety or body politick is ſo like to run upon miſcarriages, ſeeing the lawes to which Chriſt ties, are ſo averſe to our natures, when we can bear others; we are apt to ſay, we will break theſe bonds, and caſt them away from us. Satan enyies no other ſociety, or bond of men, as he doth the ſociety, or bond of Chriſtians. His kingdome will conſiſt together with all other ſtates and kingdomes; they may rule, and he rule likewiſe; onely this of Chriſts Kingdome, is wholly averſe to Satans; and militates againſt it, for the ruine of it. 3. The Church from the beginning hath exerciſed this power within it ſelf, when all other powers were adverſe, and contrary to it. How long was it before the Church had a Chriſtian Magiſtrate, and lay under the perſecution of heathen ſtates? in all which time a diſcipline vvas yet kept up. If the Church had no ſuch povver, hovv could it then exerciſe it? 4. The Churches that have been remiſſe in their improvement of this povver, have had their check from Chriſt himſelf in glory. He manifeſts his diſpleaſure from heaven againſt the Church of *Pergamos*, that they had thoſe that held the doctrine of *Balaam*, and the doctrine of the *Nicolaitans*; and againſt the Church of *Thyatira*, becauſe they ſuffered *Jeſabel* to teach and ſeduce his ſervants, *Rev.* 2. 14, 15, 20. The cenſure that lyes upon the Kings of *Judah* upon neglect of reformation in their time, argues that they vvere in povver for it. So the cenſure of theſe Churches upon like account argues their povver in like manner. Even thoſe that plead moſt for freedome of conſcience, and liberty in religion, vvith all impunity from the civil povver, yet confeſſe from theſe and like texts, a povver vvithin the Church it ſelf for cenſure of delinquencies. To all this ſome are ready to ſubſcribe (as being not able to gainſay the clear Scripture evidence of a povver Eccleſiaſtical) and confeſſe, that it vvas ſo in thoſe times, but novv they contend that the caſe is othervviſe. Providence hath ordered a change of things, and all is ſwallowed up in the hand of him that is chief in power, ſince the time that the Church hath enjoyed Kings for her *nurſing fathers*, and Queens for her *nurſing mothers*, not barely accuſing them of error that diſſent in opinion, but charging them to reſemble thoſe ſons of *Belial*, that upon the *Iſraelites* inſtitution of Kingſhip, were ungratefully asking this

queſtion, *How ſhall this man ſave us?* 1 Sam. 10. 27. Making good their aſſertion of a change of this nature by this ſimilitude. *As in the firſt Church among the Jewes whileſt they were in a wandring condition, as their need was greater, ſo Gods perſonal providence, and guidance of them was more expreſſe, and apparent, and therefore whileſt they were in this Theocraty, their government was not to be managed by any ſetled univerſal authority, beſides that of God himſelf, or any one who took not in all weighty things immediate direction from him, until ſuch time as being throughly ſettled in peace, and ſecurity from their enemies he might make his receſſe, and permit and appoint to them a King of their own Nation; So in the firſt founding of the Chriſtian Church during the time of their perſecution, as their weakneſſe required, were in a Theocraty too, guided by the expreſſe direction of our Saviour himſelf given to the Apoſtles during the time of thoſe fourty daies that he was converſant with them upon earth; but now after the time that God hath perfected the time of the Churches deliverance, and free eſtabliſhment in peace, and reſt from all about her, and the Prophecy is fulfilled by appointing Kings her nurſing fathers, and Queens her nurſing mothers, and having ſons to be ſet as Princes in all Lands, ſo that now under Conſtantine the uproomes, and wandring Tabernacles, (as formerly under Solomon) are converted into ſtately temples, for men now to think of their running into their Wilderneſſe, and perſecuted condition, by entertaining thoſe temporary forms which unto that condition were moſt fit, doth import both ingratitude and murmur againſt God, and imprudence towards themſelves.* Thus farre this ſimilitude. But thoſe of this opinion I doubt would take ill that free dealing toward themſelves, which they uſe toward others, and that upon their caſting off all Eccleſiaſtical government, under the notion of temporary forms, we ſhould apply that ſpeech of the Lord himſelf to *Samuel*, concerning the people of *Iſrael* upon their reſolution to make a change in government, 1 *Sam.* 8. 7. *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I ſhould not reign over them.* And to make the diſſimilitude in this ſimile further apparent, it ſhould I ſuppoſe be taken into conſideration, that when God was pleaſed firſt to permit, and then appoint a King over *Iſrael*, that the former fabrick of Government written in the Law was not taken down, but the whole Levitical order ſtill ſtood, as to all purpoſes preſcribed of God; the change was no more, nor further but in him

that

that rul'd in chief. Inſtead of one raiſed by an immediate hand of God, as their exigence required, they now had one after the manner of other Nations, of conſtant ſtanding. And God forbid that we ſhould murmur, that the Church hath her ſons for Princes, and that thoſe that rule over us, ſerve the Lord Jeſus with us. But we think that theſe ſervants of Chriſt thus raiſed in honour, ſhould ſee that what Chriſt hath ſet up ſhould be aright managed, and that they ſhould have that inſpection, as the Kings of *Judah* had, to rectifie what they find out of order, but not to pull down any thing that Jeſus Chriſt had raiſed up, no more then the praiſe-worthy Kings of *Judah*, did that which *Moſes* had preſcribed; eſpecially ſeeing the Lord Chriſt, even in the ſpace of thoſe forty daies before mentioned, aſſerting his pleni-potentiary power that he had received from his Father, and giving power to his Church, declares it to be of that laſting tenure, to continue to the end of the world, *Matth.* 28. 18, 19, 20. And becauſe theſe words which import this continuance, are variouſly interpreted, and ſome will underſtand them with limit to the end of the Apoſtles age, ſeeing the age of a man is often ſet out by the word *ſeculum*, the ſports at *Rome* which were ſeen once in mans age, were called *ludi ſeculares*, and ſo we have this text againſt us. But againſt this interpretation let the Reader obſerve, 1. The frequent uſe of the phraſe, ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, to the end of the world by this Evangeliſt, chap. 13. 39. The harveſt is the end of the world, ver. 40. So ſhall it be in the end of this world, ver. 49. So ſhall it be in the end of the world; and, *Matt.* 24. 3. Tell us when ſhall theſe things be, what ſhall be the ſign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? none of all which can be underſtood of the end of one, but of all ages. 2. Let the context there be conſidered; Chriſt there promiſes his preſence in the work of diſcipling all Nations, but that was not the work of one age onely, many ages are paſt over, and yet many Nations are not diſcipled. His preſence is promiſed in the Word and Sacraments, which muſt have their continuance till Chriſts ſecond coming, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. The Apoſtles words, *Heb.* 9. 26. may well ſerve for a comment on theſe words of our Saviour; the alone place (as *Gomarus* notes) where this phraſe is uſed, excepting the texts out of *Matthew* mentioned: *But now once in the end of the world he hath appeared, to put away ſin by the Sacrifice of himſelf.* There are two ages of the world, one determining upon Chriſts ſuffering,

ing, reſurrection, and aſcenſion; the other commencing at that time, and concluding at the end of all time; and therefore the ſpace betwixt Chriſts firſt and ſecond comming is ordinarily called the laſt daies. Chriſt dyed at the conſummation of the firſt, and the promiſe of his preſence is made till the conſummation of the ſecond; and the power given and received, is no otherwiſe temporary.

Caut. 2. Ruling Elders not hereby prejudiced, Various opinions concerning them.

2. Neither is this to make for the prejudice of the office of ruling Elders, concerning whom there is in the Church ſo hot diſpute. Some own no ſuch power, but make it to be a new device not heard of before this laſt age. Others plead a divine right for it, and produce Scriptures that appear to ſpeak very fair that way, though they meet with very ſhrewd objections. A third not inſiſting upon any ſuch formal inſtitution, being jealous that the texts held forth will ſcarce bear it out, yet concluding that the whole body of the faithful have their intereſt in government (Church Government being neither Monarchical, nor purely Ariſtocratical, but mixt with a Democraty) they bring in ruling Elders, not as officers ſet up by any immediate inſtitution, but as repreſenters of the people. So that as Knights appear in Parliament, not in their own names (as the Peers of the realm heretofore have done) but in the name of the reſpective Counties, and Burgeſſes in the name of their reſpective Corporations; ſo ruling Elders choſen by the vote of the people, have no other power, but what they exerciſe in the name and right of thoſe that ſet them up. Paſtors have their power primitively veſted in their own perſons by immediate appointment of Chriſt Jeſus. Theſe have power by way of delegation from them that authorize and appoint them; others yet are not at all diſpleaſed with this power, but upon neither of the former grounds, but as a prudential courſe for the more eaſy and orderly regulating of the affairs of the Church, in caſe either the chief Magiſtrate ſhall ſet them up, or the Church it ſelf by his appointment, allowance or connivance: Aſſerting a liberty in the chief Magiſtrate, or Church for this purpoſe, That as in the Jewiſh *Sanedrim*, there were of the people appointed to aſſiſt the Prieſts, both in civil, and ſacred affaires, ſo when nothing to the contrary appears in New Teſtament-times it may be ſtill ſo provided. As the Church might ſet up ſome to determine Controverſies, and prevent lawſuits, 1 *Cor.* 6. 4. and might appoint a brother to be joyned with Apoſtles,

Apoſtles, to receive and disburſe the Churches Alms, 2 *Cor.* 8. 9, 10. And the Church of *Antioch* might delegate ſome to be preſent at the debate, and determination of the Apoſtles and Elders of *Jeruſalem* in a caſe then controverted, *Act.* 15. 2. ſo it is not unlawful with prudent limits to appoint ſome that may be aſſiſtant to carry on Church Government. I ſhall not determine on what bottome it is ſafeſt to fix them; I onely ſay, that I do not ſee how the Church can well want them. And though Mr. *Mede* (whom ſome adore as their oracle for antiquity, and all deſervedly magnifie) calls it a new device, yet *Grotius* of no leſſe eſteem, ſpeaks with more favour, *Imper. Summar. poteſtat. circa Sacra. Cap.* 11. After a large diſcourſe about them, He ſaith, *that it appears by that which we have ſaid, that in the office of Aſſeſſors, which are in uſe in ſome places (whom for diſtinction ſake we may call temporary, or lay Elders) there is nothing that may be blamed.* Affirming further, that *there is not wanting in Sacred Antiquity examples which come very near to this cuſtome, though not wholly up to it.* Neither does he make *Geneva*, with ſome others, the firſt Authors, but onely the chief defenders of this order, inſtancing in the benefit that may hence ariſe both reſpective to the civil Magiſtrate, and Church Paſtors. The ſecond of theſe with me is very rational, and being fixt upon that bottome, though thoſe exceptions hold that are uſually taken againſt thoſe texts, on which their Divine autority is uſually built; yet the order may ſtill ſtand, and thoſe negative arguments which are brought againſt them, from the Apoſtles inſcription of his Epiſtle to the *Philippians* directed to Biſhops, and Deacons without mention of ruling Elders, as alſo from the diſtinct qualifications required in Biſhops and Deacons with their wives and families, when as to theſe Elders there is all ſilence, may be more eaſily anſwered in caſe it appear that theſe had not any conſtant ſtanding in this work. I onely here ſay that on what bottome ſoever they ſtand, this which I have ſaid can nothing prejudice them.

Apparet ex his quæ diximus in munere adſeſſorum, qui nonnullis in locis in uſu ſunt (quos diſtinctionis cauſa temporarios aut laicos præſbyteros appellare poſſumus) nihil eſſe quod poſſit reprehendi.

Non deeſſe in pia antiquitate exempla, quæ ſi non plane conveniant, certe ad hunc morem accedunt.

Quæ urbs, ſi non prima ταύτην τὴν συνέδριαν, certe præcipuos ejus defenſores edidit.

3. Neither muſt this exempt admiſſion to, or excluſion from the Sacrament, from all cognizance of Church power, nor quite take it out of the verge of their cenſures, though thoſe in juridick place be not aforehand conſulted or taken into aſſociation in it. For though it be left ſolely to Paſtors to diſcern thoſe to whom they may diſtribute theſe Elements, as it is to divide the Word, and give

Cautio 3. Not to be wholly exempted from all cognizance of Church-power.

give every one his portion, yet upon mal-administration they may be called to question. If *pro imperio* they shall keep back those that are duly qualified, or admit such that evidently according to Church-determination should be denyed; they are liable to censure, as they are for corruption, or imprudence in doctrine. And therefore it was well provided, Canon 27. *That he that shall repel any from the Sacrament, upon complaint, or being required by the Ordinary shall signifie the cause to him, and therein obey his direction.* Presupposing Church power to be vested in him (who for the most part was a meer lay person, which might cause ruling Elders to stand more right in the eyes of some persons) this was well determin'd. Should Pastors be set up for this work, without any appeal, or controul, it might then indeed be spoken to as a grievance.

Cauti. 4. A Ministers prudence to take in assistants.

4. It is a Ministers wisdome, if it may be, to see with more eyes then his own, and to take in to himself, if they may be had, assistants in this work; especially to judge of men as to their conversations, and to be witnesses of their promises and engagements in case admonition be needful for amendment and reformation. More eyes see more then one, and reason it self suggests the convenience of all helps to be taken in to lighten the burden. *Paul* tells *Timothy* of the profession that he had made before many witnesses, 1 *Tim.*6.12. as a Motive to be constant. An engagement made before witnesses, carries authority with it, and possesses with shame upon violation of it. Thus the Pastor also shall in a great part avoid that charge of partiality, that notwithstanding all circumspection he is like to suffer. If any object that this is to set up officers *pro arbitrio*, which will make way for the introduction of any upon like grounds of supposed prudence; I answer, this were somewhat if he should make over his power from himself by delegation, being himself in office; But discharging his duty in his own person, he may doubtlesse take in all usefull helps. *Paul* may make use of *Tertius* to write Epistles to Churches, and yet not make him an Apostle; *Aaron* and *Hur* may stay up *Moses* his hands, and yet not usurp *Moses* his place.

Cauti. 5. Where an Eldership is erected to imbrace them as helpers.

5. Where an Eldership is erected, then gladly to imbrace them as helpers in the work. Happily they may think their power weakened, and their right denyed in case they joyn not in it. If the Pastor be of another judgement, it is not yet his prudence

prudence to raiſe ſtirs about it. If others come in as aſſiſtant to carry on what he might otherwiſe do alone, he hath ſmall cauſe of grievance; it ſavours too much of arrogance, and of the ſpirit of ſuch as love preheminence to affect to be alone, though it is ordinarily moſt ſeen in reſolving, and attempting to overrule all where a man confeſſes himſelf to be no more then in aſſociation with others. And for thoſe that refuſe to come where an Elderſhip ſits, it argues too ſullen an humour. Were I an inhabitant in *London* or like place, I ſhould take my ſelf to be bound to paſſe through all the Elderſhips there, rather then hold out of Communion.

Cauti. 6. To proceed with all gentleneſſe in tryall of mens knowledge.

6. In making ſcrutiny into the knowledge of them that offer themſelves to deal with all gentleneſſe, eſpecially towards ſuch as have been of a more mean education; many times ſuch know that which they can ſcarce expreſſe, and ſtrength of affection is often ſeen in plain hearts without any great light. Let theſe be holpen in their words, and let ſpeech be to them in words fitted to their capacity. Let not a queſtion be put of any thing ſave that which is needful to be known; when it appears that the creation is known, and particularly mans eſtate by creation in the image of God, and his fall by ſin, and redemption through Chriſt; ſo that the party can diſtinguiſh the Perſons in the Trinity, to give an account which of them is the Saviour of the world, that each perſon is God, the ſecond God, and man in aſſuming our nature; and withall able to give an account of the death of Chriſt in ſatisfaction for ſin, our way of intereſt by believing, the neceſſity of repentance and a new life, as qualifications of thoſe that ſhall be ſaved: knowing the outward ſigns in the Sacrament, and in ſome competent meaſure their ſignification and uſe; Such may be exhorted with tenderneſſe to grow in knowledge, but not to be kept back as ignorant ones.

Cauti. 7. Not to refuſe but upon known crimes. Nos a Communione quemquam prohibere non poſſumus niſi

7. Neither is a Miniſter upon whiſper of any ſcandal, to ſet upon proof by witneſſes, much leſſe to undertake the giving of oathes to that purpoſe, as hath been obſerved out of *Suarez*: But upon evidence of knowledge of a way in flagitious practices known to him, and ſcarce doubted by any. That of *Auſtin* is famous, *We can forbid none Communion, unleſſe he voluntarily make*

aut ſponte confeſſum aut in aliquo judicio Eccleſiatico vel ſeculari nominatum atq; convi tum

confession, and be called and convicted in some Court, either Ecclesiastical or Civil. I know this is produced by some, to prove that a single Minister may not in any case withhold the Sacrament from any person. But this is a great mistake, it onely proves, that upon any particular charge it cannot be done without due proof, and proof cannot be made without power of judicature, either Civil or Ecclesiastical. *Aquinas* quotes this of *Austin*, Sum. 13. quæst. 80. art. 6. and yet he never doubted of the sole power of the Pastor in it. It plainly thence appears, that there were both Ecclesiastical and Civil Courts, then appointed to take cognizance of crimes, which some would make to be inconsistent; And that Ministers did take occasion upon convictions there, to deny Communion. It doth no more prove that a Minister hath no such power, otherwise in an Ecclesiastical Consistory, then it proves that he hath no power without strength of a secular Judicatory. It indeed proves that which it is brought to overthrow, which is the Ministers single power: The Minister makes equal advantage in either Court in his prudentiall proceedings in administration of the Sacrament.

Cauti. 8. 8. As it is concluded by many that place power of admission in an Eldership, that a Minister wanting that assistance, may then deliver the Sacrament to those from whom otherwise he should withdraw his hand; and a learned Treatise is written to that purpose wanting authority to do what regularly might be done; He is not withstanding (as is said) to do his duty in administration. So I might, I think, with as much reason say, that in case a Minister be overborn with power in his people, that he cannot do that in debarring of those which his judgement leads him to deny, without evident hazard of the utter disturbance of the peace of his place, he is scarce to run the hazard; when he cannot do the good that he would, he must do the good that he can; he is to do so much the more in publick warning of the sin, and the danger, as he can do the lesse in authoritative denyal, and withholding his hand from them. If it might appeare to me that God hath vested an Eldership, and no other in that trust, I think it were scarce safe to put a mans self without them upon administration, last it should be like to that of *Saul*, when he forced himself to offer a burnt-offering, because *Samuel* came not in the appointed time: But no such thing appearing in Scripture, nor any sufficient reason evincing it, I take it to be in the

When a Minister cannot do what he would, he must do what he is able.

the Ministers hands so to dispense it, as the Church may receive most of edification by it. And when he is so overruled that he cannot act as he would, he must act as he can. A Steward set over the house, and a Commander or Leader in any Army is sometimes put upon such necessities. *Suarez* is as zealous as any other against the delivery of the Sacrament to those that are unworthy of it, yet bounds it with this caution, *If the Minister may do it without inconvenience*; And putting the objection, *That not to give the Sacrament to an unworthy person is a negative precept, that binds* ad semper, *to all times, and therefore never to be done.* He answers that *this Precept is not simply Negative, but is to be reduced to an Affirmative, which is prudently and faithfully to dispense this Sacrament, which being formally taken is alwayes to be observed, as often as this Sacrament is administred, and so it comes to passe that if it may be, it is to be denyed to those that are unworthy, not that it is alwayes to be denyed upon any inconvenience whatsoever.*

Nor let any charge me as being too indulgent to such men, seeing none that I know of any party is of another mind. They that stand for Eldership, will have this done by the Minister, when the Eldership overrules it. And those of the Congregrational way, when the Congregation in the majority, votes for it. And may not the Minister do the same thing when he sees that he is put upon like or greater necessity in it? The Churches edification in the first place should be considered, but the peace of the Church by no means neglected; alwayes provided, that unworthy ends of self-advantage, pusillanimity, base compliances (which may be as soon seen in the majority of a multitude, as in one single person) do not over-rule it, and may be our temptation in dispensation of the Word, as well as the Sacrament, and with all care, courage, study, prayer, to be avoided; That the Apostles severe charge, *1 Tim.* 5. 21. may be conscienciously heeded, Doing nothing by partiality.

SECT. XVII.

A Corollary drawn from former doctrines.

Sacraments are to be received from that hand that God hath assigned.

FRom these two observations above mentioned, *That God is the author*, and *The Covenant people of God the subject of the Sacraments*, this followes by way of Corollary, that *The people of God are therefore to receive them from that hand, that God is pleased to appoint to administer and dispense them to them*. If God please to vouchsafe a gift, he is worthy to appoint the hand for conveyance. This might have been the employment of Angels in glory, whom he makes ministring Spirits, and to whose charge he commits his servants; but he hath chosen another way communicating it by man to the sons of men; honouring men so farre as to entrust them with these Mysteries, whereby he, 1. makes tryal of their faithfulnesse, whom he thus entrusts in so noble an employment, as the dispensation of his Covenant, and seal, his Word and Sacraments. 2. He makes known his power, setting up weak man in his cause to oppose, and get the upper hand over Satan, and the world: *chusing the weak things of this world to confound the mighty*. 3. He provides for his own glory, which would have been endangered, in case Angels had been employed in this Ambassy; when an Angel was sent to *John*, he was ready to forget himself, in his extasie to worship the Angel, *Revel.* 19. 10. 22. 9. In case the Treasure were in heavenly vessels, the glory would be of the vessel, and not of God; we should have conceived so much glory there, that we should have looked no higher. 4. He condescends to our infirmity, that are not able to bear divine apparitions. This man hath known by experience, *Judg.* 13. 22. *Luke* 2. 9. and God himself hath considered, *Deut.* 18. 16, 17. 5. He thereby makes tryal of our humility, and obedience, whether we will submit to such which he sets up, though no other motive but his appointment appears in it: yet this is not handed over to us promiscuously by all, or any of the sons of men, but those that he hath chosen *from among men in things appertaining to God*, Heb. 5. 1. The Apostle lets us know that *all are not Apostles, all are not Prophets, all are not teachers, all are not workers of miracles*, 1 Cor. 12. 29. so we may conclude all are not stewards, every household servant is not set over the house-

household to give meat in due season. This is a work in Gospel times proper to the Ministers of Christ, as by several Arguments may be made to appear. 1. They that were sent out to convert and instruct, were in commission alone to baptize, *Matth.* 28. 19. But the Ministers of Christ are senr out to convert and instruct; they onely are spiritual Fathers, Teachers, *&c.* Therefore this is their businesse, as before this commission it was by divine warranty practised by *John Baptist*, and afterwards according to the commission through the Acts of the Apostles. 2. the Supper of the Lord is a setting forth of the death of Christ, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. and therefore alone their businesse in a publick way who are to preach Christ crucified, 1 *Cor.* 1. 23. 3. They are the stewards of the Mysteries of God, 1 *Cor.* 4. 1. These are of his Mysteries, the outward elements as they hold out, and seal Gospel-promises unto us. 4. They are set over the household of God, to give them their meat in due season, having in charge to feed the Flock of God, which is among them, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. 5. Sacraments are a visible Word, which never can profit, unlesse they be opened, and the Mystery be interpreted. 6. They are seales of the Gospel-covenant, and instituted appendants to it, and therefore to be dispensed by Gospel-Ministers, that are in commission to preach the Gospel. And so Mr. *Tombes* his quibble is against him. *Though* (saith he) *the title of the Minister of the Gospel be used in the New Testament, yet the title of the Ministers of the Sacrament is a made title*, Præcurs. pag. 82. Sacraments are comprized in the Gospel, and Ministers of the Gospel comprizes Ministers of the Sacraments. 7. All ages of the Church give in their votè with it, no Church regularly giving this power to any other; Yet I would have this understood with this caution, that I do not so make it of the essence of Sacraments in general, that no Sacrament can have any being, but in the hand of a publick Minister, seeing, for ought we can read, neither Circumcision, nor the Paschal Lamb were committed to the hands of men in Ministerial function. Circumcision was given in charge to the parent, and whether his own hand, or any others should be employed in it, it is not mentioned. They might (for ought we read) make use of those that were most dextrous in it. And for the Paschal Lamb, *Rivet* among the Calvinists, and *Gerard* among the Lutherans deny, that it was to be brought to the Priest to offer; and though both were Sacraments, (as may be objected)

The dispensation of Sacraments is a part of the Ministerial function. Arguments evincing it.

Whether Ministerial dispensation be of the essence of Sacraments?

objected) instituted before the Priesthood was settled, and while the first born were authorized for publick Ministerial acts, yet we do not then find it charged on the first born, nor yet afterwards vested in the Priesthood; neither do I yet judge it to be so of the integrality of the Sacraments of the New Testament, that it should be no manner of Sacrament, if it be not carried on by the hand of a Minister, The matter and form being first instituted, the Sacrament, is after put into a Ministers hand to dispense it. And I see not a flat nullity of a Sacrament, but a foul breach of Gospel-order, when that way is neglected. As *David* felt to his grief, and was brought to confesse a foul mis-prision, in the order of Gods worship, when the Ark was carried on a Cart, and not on the Levites shoulders, 1 *Chron.* 15. 13. so it is when the Sacraments are delivered by any other hand then a Ministers; yet the Ark (though carried as it ought not) whereso ever it was, it was yet the Ark of God; so these ordinances (though administred as they ought not) are yet still Sacraments, they are still divine instituted ordinances, where the man is such that hath his interest, by a free Covenant grant; and the Ordinance is the seal appointed for ratification of this Covenant, though conveyed by an unmeet hand, it is (I suppose) no meer nullity, though a transgression. That of Mr. *Hooker*, Ecclesiastical Policy, lib. 5. Sect. 62. is worth our observation: *If any thing be herein amisse, the harm which groweth by violation of holy ordinances, must altogether rest where the bond of such ordinances holds.* And having shewed how it is otherwise in jurisdiction, he addes, *Factum alterius alii nocere non debet. Baptisme on the other hand being a favour which it pleaseth God to bestow, a benefit of the soul for us to receive it, and a Grace which they that deliver, are but as meer vessels, either appointed by others, or offered on their own accord to this service; of which two if they be, the one it is but their own honour, their own offence to be the other, can it possibly stand with equity and right that the faultinesse of their presumption in giving Baptisme, should be able to prejudice us, who by taking Baptisme have no way offended?* We justly abominate the opinion of Papists on the one hand, that make the intention of the Minister to be of the essence of the Sacrament, so that if that be wanting, there is no Sacrament, as also the opinion of Donatists of old, and Anabaptists of later times on the other hand, that make the quality of the Minister likewise essential; so that where he is defective in holinesse and fidelity, there the Sacrament

The negative judged probable.

Gospel order transgressed, when Sacraments are otherwise dispenced.

crament must of necessity be wanting in its power and efficacy. And these opinions we reject as upon other accounts, so upon this that it brings Christians into inextricable straits, how shall they reach the Ministers intention, at the time that he is about this businesse; None knowes (but he that searcheth the heart) his thoughts at that time, and so no other knowes whether any more then common water hath been applyed, or common bread received. How shall they know the Ministers goodnesse? how shall they know his graces? Hypocrisie is spunne with a thred so fine, that anothers eye cannot discern. And in case the Ministers goodnesse were but seeming goodnesse, then that which we received were but seeming Sacraments. This opinion of the very essence of Sacraments, depending on the lawfulnesse of the call of Ministers, puts them to little lesse trouble. If a man will know whether he were ever baptized, he must be put to it, to make enquiry whether his Baptist were lawfully ordained, being happily dead before he is able to put this to the question. And this being the Sacrament of his initiation, he may well question whether he stand actually and orderly enrighted in any Church? privileg, or be in any orderly way any Church-member, in case this fail? Many things being done, are of force, and stand firm, though he that did them deserves no praise. Though they do not nullify a Sacrament, yet they break a Gospel rule, *Factum valet, faciendum non est*, is an old maxime. And the more neer men come to the place of the Ministerial function, the more unquestionable is the validity of such administrations, when any assumes other parts of the Ministerial function, to officiate in publick in that way that the peoples esteem of him, is as of a Minister called to this work; those that otherwise seem much to scruple, yet then conclude, that as a Gospel promise is a promise, though from his mouth whom God hath not sent to preach the Gospel, so a Gospel Sacrament from his hand, is a Sacrament. The call and the work, are not so inviolably joyned, but that the work is done, though unduly, by him that is not called to it; yet though the validity of the work be asserted, the disorder must be opposed. Entring upon *Aarons* work, and never called of God, as *Aaron* was; with *Vzziah* officiating in that work, that appertains not to him; leaving scruples in the thoughts of those, to whom in this disorder they have administred these ordinances. This the Church hath never suffered, save onely that Papists and Lutherans

rans diſpenſe with Baptiſme in caſe of neceſſity (putting ſo much weight upon it, and placing ſuch efficacy in it) which the Chnrch of *England* alſo ſuffered after the reformation till King *James* his dayes, and then (as appears in the conference at Hampton-Court) it was reformed. Dr. *Abbot* in his Lectures read, while it ſtood in power, appeared publickly againſt it, and as I remember (for the book is not in my hands) affirmed, that zealous Miniſters then generally did diſtaſte, and decry it. The Midwife was uſually employed in the work as neareſt at hand, to caſt water upon the infant ready to dye in her armes, though in no capacity of that function by reaſon of her ſex; and though the ſex might have born it, ſhe was never called to it. But they muſt firſt make that good, that all periſh without Baptiſme, or that the act of Baptiſme aſſures us of ſalvation, before they can juſtifie this practice, (Proteſtant Writers with irrefragable arguments oppoſing it) produce as a diſpenſation from God for the breach of an order by him ſet up; otherwiſe we ſhall conclude that from the time of the ſaid conference, it hath juſtly been put into the hands of the lawful Miniſter; and notwithſtanding Mr. *Tombes* his quibble, it was upon juſt grounds concluded by the late Aſſembly in their confeſſion of faith, Chapter 27. Sect. 4.

SECT. XVIII.

A further Corollary from the former doctrine.

All that are intereſted in Sacraments muſt come up to the termes of the Covenant.

IT further followes, that all thoſe that intereſt themſelves in Sacraments, expecting benefit by Baptiſme, and comfort at the Lords Table; muſt come up to the tearms of the Covenant. They receive them as ſignes and badges of a people in Covenant with God; They receive them as ſeals of the Covenant, God puts to his ſeal, to be a God in Covenant: In their acception they engage as by ſeal to be his people in Covenant. The obligation now is mutual, in caſe man fail on his part, God is diſobliged: If any tye be upon him, it is to inflict the juſt merit of breach of Govenant upon them. I have ſpoken to the neceſſity that lyes upon the Miniſters of Chriſt, to bring their people

people up to the termes and Propositions of it, Treatise of the Covenant, chap. 20, 21. Here I speak to it onely as the interest in the Sacraments tyes to it: And this obligation hath all force and strength in it. When God entred Covenant with man in his integrity, upon condition of perfect and compleat obedience, and gave him (as we have heard) Sacraments for the ratification and confirmation of it; when man failing in obedience, and falling short of the duty of the Covenant, those Sacraments were of no avail; notwithstanding the tree of life man dyed, and notwithstanding the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, man became brutish in his own knowledge. It fares no better with those that are under a Covenant of grace, and live and persist in breach of Covenant; we see the heavy curse that God pronounceth against them, *Jer.* 11.3,4. *Thus saith the Lord God of* Israel, *Cursed be the man that obeyeth not the words of this Covenant, which I commanded your Fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the Land of* Egypt, *from the iron Furnace, saying, Obey my voyce, and do them, according to all which I Command; so shall ye be my people, and I will be your God.* And to this *Jeremy* adds his *Amen* or *So be it, O Lord*; which assent of his, though it may be referred to the Prophets duty in obedience of Gods Command, when he had said to him, ver. 2,3. *Speak to the men of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be every man that obeyeth not*, &c. The Prophet in these words says, What thou hast enjoyn'd me I will do it; and so *Junius* and *Tremelius* understand it; or to the Prophets earnest desire to have the promise fulfilled, which the Lord utters in the close of his speech, ver. 5. *That I may perform the oath which I have sworn unto your fathers, to give them a Land flowing with milk and honey, as it is this day.* To which the Prophet answers, So, Lord, let it be, that this people being careful to keep Covenant with thee, may still enjoy that Land which thou didst by oath bind thy self to settle them in, as the last larger Annotations understand it, or to *Jeremies* answer in the name of the people binding themselves to obedience, as *Diodati* understands it; yet doubtlesse it also comprizeth the Prophets acknowledgement of the equity that the curse should fall on those that obey not the words of the Covenant. The *Amen* is of that latitude, that it comprizeth the whole that goes before of the Prophets duty, his desire, the peoples obligation, and the equity of the curse that lyes upon

disobedience. As the Sacraments in Paradise could be no protection to man in sin, so the Sacraments under the present Covenant (whether in the old dispensation of it in the dayes of the Fathers, or new dispensation of it in Gospel-times) can be no protection of those that lye in unbelief and impenitence. Let not an unbeliever, let not an impenitent person think to find shelter here, as the Jewes did think to find in the Temple, and say, *They are delivered to do these abominations.* Priviledge of Sacraments can help Christians no more, then birth-priviledge could the Jewes, who are checkt by *John Baptist* for making it a plea to this purpose, and called to *bring forth fruits worthy of repentance, and amendment of life,* Matth. 3. I do not say that unlesse you are assured, that you do believe to justification, and repent in sincerity and unfeignednesse, that you must not come to the Lords Table. I have declared my self to the contrary, but I say you must make it your businesse to believe; your work to repent in truth and sincerity, or else you shall never find here acceptation. The Covenant of works was for mans preservation in life, and *Adam* could have help towards immortality in the tree of life no longer then he made it his businesse to keep up to that which the Covenant required. The Covenant of grace is for mans restitution to life, none under this Covenant can find any help towards life in any Sacraments annext to it, otherwise then in keeping up faith and repentance, which are the termes and conditions of it. Which way doest thou expect life in the Sacrament, either of thy initiation, or confirmation, either in Baptisme, or the Lords Supper? is it in the Sacrament it self? or is it in Christ that thou shouldest seek and look after in the Sacrament? If thou lookest for it from Sacraments, thou Idolizest them and deceivest thy own soul. Bread and Wine never were, nor ever can be saviours: Our Fathers ate Manna in the Wilderness, and are dead, *Joh.* 6. We may eat bread at the Lords Table, and eternally dye. All *Israel* in the wilderness did eat of Manna, and drank of the Rock which the Apostle calls *Spiritual meat, Spiritual drink,* being Sacramentally such, yet *with many of them God was not well pleased, but they were overthrown in the Wilderness,* 1 Cor. 10. 5. If thou sayest thou lookest for life in Christ, I desire to know where thou findest that men in unbelief have life in Christ. The Apostle saith, *I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me;* and presently adds, *The life that I live in*

the

the fleſh, I live by faith in the Son of God, Gal. 2. 20. And the ſame we may ſay of repentance, Chriſt with his own mouth denounceth death and deſtruction to the impenitent, *I tell you, Nay, except ye repent, ye ſhall all likewiſe periſh,* Luk. 13. Where he gives life he gives repentance to life, *Act.* 11. 18. I have ſaid that the Sacrament may be improved with the help of the Word towards converſion; But if there be no ſuch change already wrought in thy ſoul, nor any ſuch thing in thy endeavour, then this great Ordinance is ſadly prophaned; thou pretendeſt to Chriſt, when indeed thou treadeſt under foot the blood of Chriſt; ſeemingly wouldſt have thy intereſt in his blood, and doſt become guilty of his blood. Here Chriſts death is ſet out, his ſufferings for ſin, called to remembrance. Art not thou now affected with delight in his death, when thou art affected with delight in thy ſin? when thou ſeeſt a man murthered, and ſporteſt with the murtherers, with thoſe whom thou knoweſt to have had the alone hand in the murther, how then doſt not thou be come an acceſſory? This is the caſe of the man that comes to the Sacrament, and will keep his ſin. He looks not upon Chriſt Sacramentally broke to the breaking of his heart, but he looks upon him to his hearts rejoycing. Look upon all that hath been ſaid of the danger of unworthy receiving, by all that have written practically upon this ſubject; all is thy danger that art in ſin, and reſolveſt not to relinquiſh; thou art admitted into the Church by Baptiſme, and upon that account art of that number, and reckoneſt thy ſelf among thoſe that are called Chriſtians, and here perhaps thou haſt hopes, highly prizeſt this priviledge; as ſometimes the Jews did circumciſion in order to the favour of God, and aſſurance of eternal life: And doubtleſſe rightly underſtood it is to be prized, otherwiſe God would not have given it, it is an *honorarium*, or token of love to his people. Nor would the Apoſtle *Peter* have ſaid that *Baptiſme ſaves*, 1 Pet. 3. 21. But our building of hopes upon Scripture-words without Scripture-Comment doth undo us. When the Jewes took theuſelves to be ſecure againſt all the judgements that the Prophets could denounce by reaſon of ſin, upon the priviledge of circumciſion; *Jeremy* undervalues not circumciſion at all, but helps them to a right underſtanding of it; will have them to have it full and compleat, reckoning up many Nations by name, he ſaith, They are uncircumciſed, they were wholly deſtitute of it; and mentio-

ning the houſe of *Iſrael,* ſaith, that they are uncircumciſed in heart, *Jer.*9.26. They want the beſt and choiſeſt part of it, and ſo are in the ſame condition with uncircumciſed ones; and the Apoſtle after him beating down the vain confidence of the Jewes in their outward title called Jewes, and circumciſion, which was a badge of their relation to God as a people in Covenant, tells them, that he is not a Jew that is one outwardly, that was not enough to give a full and true denomination; but *he is a Jew that is one inwardly,* who is for God in ſoul, as well as in name, and *circnmciſion is that of the heart,* Rom. 2.28. and he beats down the carnal opinion of the Jewes in circumciſion, by a definition given of the circumciſed, *We are of the circumciſion, that worſhip God in Spirit and in truth,* Phil.3.3. And baptiſme of the fleſh can neither be, nor do more, then circumciſion in the fleſh: The Apoſtle therefore telling us that Baptiſme ſaves, is as willing to undeceive us, as the Prophet was to undeceive the Jewes, and tells us that he doth not mean the outward putting away of the filth of the fleſh (the application of water is but the outſide of Baptiſme) but the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God; when conſcience anſwers to that which this waſhing ſignifies, and to which it engages, then Baptiſme ſaves, not of it ſelf, but ſeales Salvation through the Reſurrection of Chriſt; when conſcience fails in its duty, Baptiſme fails in its efficacy, then it brings not Salvation, but is an aggravation of condemnation, as after may appear. Thou art admitted to the Supper of the Lord, upon that account, that through knowledge gained, and profeſſion made, thou art in a capacity for improvement of it for eternity; But if thou ſtay here, and thy remembrance of Chriſt broken for ſin, do not work thee to brokenneſſe of heart under ſin; canſt drink of this Cup, and gulf in wickedneſſe, here is no pardon ſealed, but condemnation heightened. I know on the other hand, to diſcourage men from endeavour, ſome ſay, that there is no acting *for* life, but *from* life; what can be gained by ſin? and all actions done in unregeneration, are no other but ſin. I marvel then, what that Counſel of our Saviour means, *Joh.*6.27. To *labour for the meat that endures to everlaſting life,* The context acquaints us with the unregeneration of thoſe, to whom this Counſel is given; As alſo, what that complaint of our Saviour means, *Ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life.* Theſe works in unregenerate men are acts of obedience, and not

as

(as is objected) ſins, onely by accidental pollution they are ſinful; ſuch ſubtleties are above the Logick that we read in Scriptures, which gives duties in charge, in reference to their reſpective ends, without conſideration of the ſtate of the ſubject under command, whether in nature, or grace. Actions we know work to habits, and in caſe that rule hold, that *Habitus infuſi infunduntur more acquiſitorum*, which Dr. *Wilkin* ſayes, is a golden rule in Divinity, Treatiſe of the gift of prayer, pag. 8. this is above controverſie. I yeeld to that of *Auſtin*, that as a wheel is not made round by turning, but turnes becauſe it is round; ſo a man is not made good by doing good, but is good through grace, and then does good; as the tree is firſt good, and then brings forth good fruit. But it is not Gods way to infuſe grace into the ſoul unfitted for it, no more then it is to infuſe life into the body unorganized. A new being is put of God into the ſoul, when reaſon appears to it, of cloſing with it. The Word, Prayer, Sacraments, may all have a hand in it. And all are in vain to the ſoul, Word, Prayer, and Sacraments, with all other Ordinances, and endeavours, unleſſe they lead the ſoul to it; make it thy buſineſſe to come up to the Covenant, or elſe it is without fruit, that thou comeſt to the Sacrament.

CHAP. VIII. SECT. I.

Of the neceſſity of Sacraments.

Sacraments are not arbitrary but neceſſary.

THe next Obſervation that the words offer, is, *That Sacraments are not arbitrary, but neceſſary*; the Covenant-people of God, not onely may, but muſt partake of them. As God appointed, ſo *Abraham* received this ſign of circumciſion: And as he received it, ſo all in confederation with him received it likewiſe, *Gen.* 17. 23. *And Abraham took Iſhmael his ſon, and all that were born in his houſe, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abrahams houſe, and circumciſed the fleſh of their foreskin, in the ſelf-ſame day, as God had ſaid unto him.* And the ſtated time for circumciſion of thoſe children who were born of parents in Covenant, being the eighth day, the text tells us, *That Abraham circumciſed his ſon Iſaac, being eight.*

eight dayes old, as God Commanded him, Gen. 21.4. And when *Moſes* had a ſon born in his exile, and had neglected this duty; The Lord met him in his way from *Midian* to *Egypt*, and ſought to kill him, *Exod.* 4.24. he appeared in ſome formidable way of death to him, in that way (as many do conjecture) that he appeared to *Balaam* on his way, *Numb.* 22.23. Not that God really intended his death whom he now employed in that great work to deliver his people out of *Egypt*, but he appeared in this poſture, to let him know what his ſin deſerved, and by theſe terrors to bring him and his wife to take the courſe after mentioned, for prevention of it. And though there have been ſome that have gone about to aſſign other cauſes of Gods anger againſt him, and this apparition in ſuch terror, yet no other in the text appearing, and God departing from him, upon the childs circumciſion; the neglect of that Command was undoubtedly the cauſe of it. Whatſoever reaſon moved *Moſes* to this neglect, whether the fear of diſpleaſing his father in law, or his wife, (which *Rivet* judges to be moſt probable) certain it is from the Lords diſpleaſure againſt him, that it was his ſin. This was after given in charge by *Moſes* to the people of God, *Levit.* 12.3. ſpeaking of the birth of a man-child, he ſaith, *The eighth day the fleſh of his foreskin ſhall be circumciſed.* This the *Iſraelites* (except the intermiſſion of it in the wilderneſſe) exactly followed; when the eighth day happened on the Sabbath, that work was yet obſerved, as Chriſt notes, *Joh.* 7.23. *On the Sabbath day they received circumciſion, that the Law of Moſes might not be broken*; *John Baptiſt* therefore on the eighth day was circumciſed, *Luk.* 1.59. and Chriſt himſelf on that day was circumciſed, *Luk.* 2.21. as alſo *Paul*, Philip. 3.5. That of the Paſſeover was appointed 400. years at the leaſt, after circumciſion. It had its firſt inſtitution in *Egypt*, Exod. 12.3,4. &c. *to be obſerved as a feaſt to the Lord, throughout their generations, to be kept as an Ordinance for ever*, ver. 14. It was again commanded by *Moſes*, and inſerted into the body of the Law, *Levit.* 23.4. *Numb.* 28.16. This was carefully obſerved by the *Iſraelites* in their generations, though at ſome times when Idolatry prevailed, ſinfully neglected. We read of many famous Paſſeovers obſerved; *viz.* In *Joſhua's* time, in *Hezekiah's*, in *Joſiah's* dayes, alſo by *Ezra* upon the return of Gods people out of the captivity of *Babylon*, *Ezra* 6.19. It is obſerved of the Lord Chriſt, that he

kept

kept four Paſſeovers after the time that he publickly appeared as the Meſſiah. The laſt was the evening before his death, concerning which he ſaid, With a deſire have I deſired to eat this Paſſeover with you before I dye, *Luk.* 22.15. With extreme earneſt affection he was carried towards it, and then he put a period to it, and did inſtitute his Supper in the place and room of it. That heavy menace, ſo frequently threatened in the Law, of being *cut off from among their people*, is given out againſt the neglect of both of theſe Sacraments, *Gen* 17.14. *The uncircumciſed manchild whoſe fleſh of his foreskin is not circumciſed, that ſoul ſhall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my Covenant*, Num. 9. 13. *The man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the Paſſeover; even the ſame ſoul ſhall be cut off from his people, becauſe he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed ſeaſon, that man ſhall bear his ſin*; which commination however we do interpret it, whether of the more immediate hand of God, as dying childleſſe: The caſe of *Jeconiah*, Jer. 22.30. or being cut off by nntimely death: The caſe of *Er* and *Onan*, Gen. 38.1.9. and of *Nadab* and *Abihu*, Levit. 10.2. or periſhing everlaſtingly: The caſe of all preſumptuous and inpenitent ſiners, 1 *Cor.* 6.9. or whether the execution be committed to man, and that eithec the temporal Magiſtrate, which was the caſe of *Achan*, *Joſh.* 7. and of *Shelomiths* ſon, *Levit.* 24.14. or by Eccleſiaſtical cenſure, which was the caſe of the inceſtuous *Corinthian*, 1 Cor. 5.13. As there be that appear for each of theſe, which way ſoever it is underſtood, it ſufficiently proves a neceſſity of theſe Ordinances. For the Sacraments of the New Teſtament when *John* baptiſed, and the *Phariſees* did refuſe to ſubmit to his Baptiſme, the text ſaith, *They rejected the Counſel of God againſt themſelves*, Luk. 7. 30. and the Commiſſion given to the Apoſtles, to *diſciple all Nations, baptizing them*, Matth. 28.19. implyes a neceſſity of all diſcipled ones, to ſubmit to Baptiſme, *Mar.* 16.16. *He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved.* Faith is of abſolute neceſſity in all that hear the tender of the Goſpel, and therefore it followes, *He that believeth not ſhall be damned*; and Baptiſme is the ordinary way ſet up of God, that leads to it. *Peter* counſels his converts, when he had them in an hopeful way, *Repent and be Baptized*, Act. 2.38. And *Ananias* counſels *Paul*, *Ariſe, why tarrieſt thou? and be baptized*, Act. 22.16. For the Lords Supper we find it under a precept, 1 *Cor.* 11.24,25. *Luk.* 22.19. *Do this in remembrance*

Arguments evincing the neceſſity of Sacraments.

remembrance of me, 1 Cor. 11 28. *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup*, implies as a preparation for it; ſo alſo a neceſſity, that we eat and drink of it; ſo that every Sacrament hath its injunction upon it.

Firſt, The inſtitution of it is a ſufficient proof of the neceſſity. God did never inſtitute it to have it neglected; There is ſtrength in that argument from the gift to the uſe, from the fruition of any thing from the hand of God (as the ſervant the talent from his Maſter) to the improvement of it. Theſe are inſtituted of God for his people, and therefore for the uſe of his people. That which the Apoſtle ſpeaks reſpective to Goſpel ordinances in general, may be applyed to any one in particular; *We beſeech you, that ye receive not the grace of God in vain*, 2 Cor. 6. 1.

Secondly, Frequent explicite commands are added (as we have ſeen in the Scripture proofs) reſpective to either of the Sacraments; and though no other reaſon could be rendred, yet the Soveraignty of heaven muſt be obeyed. When the young Prophet that came from *Judah*, 1 *Kings* 13. did eat bread upon his return, expreſſely contrary to the command of God, we know the judgement that followed, when the like command is broke in refuſal to eat, there is the like danger; God hath power in poſitives, as well as negatives, in commanding of eating, as he hath in forbidding.

Thirdly, As it is a duty, ſo alſo a priviledg; we obey a command when we receive a Sacrament, and alſo take a gift. And the ſleighting of Gods favours, equals the evil of diſobedience to his commands. What ſin ſuffers more then theirs, that upon call, refuſe to come to the wedding ſupper? The gift is annexed to the duty. *Take eat, this is my body*; they that do not eat, have not the promiſe.

Fourthly, Our neceſſity calls us to it, we have proved the Supper to be an heart-breaking ordinance, and there is none that deny it to be a ſoule ſtrengthening ordinance. Hunger will make haſte to run to meat, guilt to pardon, and pain to eaſe, and ſorrow to comfort; were we as ſenſible of our hunger, or guilt, we ſhould make equal haſte to Chriſt in each ordinance, in this ordinance. Thoſe that are agreed about the neceſſity of Sacraments, are yet at difference about the degree, or kind of their neceſſity. That diſtinction of neceſſity by precept, or command of God, and neceſſity as a means whereby ſalvation is gained, is well known.

known [a] *Bellarmine* ſaies, we yield to them the former, that there is the neceſſity of a divine command upon them, And they alſo yield to us that no other Sacraments of theirs are any otherwiſe neceſſary, except Baptiſme and repentance. And we further yield that repentance is of neceſſity in the moſt abſolute ſenſe; being underſtood of the change of the heart or converſion to God. But not under any notion of a Sacrament. As to their Sacramental repentance, ſtanding in confeſſion in the eares of a Prieſt, taking pennance, and receiving abſolution from him, we do not ſo much as acknowledg any command of God concerning them; All the diſpute then is about Baptiſme, In which alſo we cannot grant, that there is a command given of God concerning it, but we muſt yield that it is neceſſary as a means whereby God in his ordinary way, carries us on by his grace to ſalvation; onely we deny ſuch an abſolute neceſſity of it, as that no ſalvation can be obtained without it. They yet yield that deſire of Baptiſme doth ſupply the want of it, and we yield that thoſe of years, that neither have it nor deſire it, cannot be excluded from contempt of it. This growing out of error, as in *Socinians*, and others, we ſay it is dangerous, but do not preſently conclude it damnable. But the want of it, where there can be no deſire of it, as in infants, they make damnable; in which we wholly are diſſenters, and cannot yield a neceſſity of that height in it. We have our reaſons.

[a] Adverſarii fatentur Sacramenta eſſe neceſſaria quia præcepta, et etiam neceſſaria ut media utilia: non tamen agnoſcunt ullum Sacramentum neceſſarium, ſimpliciter ut medium.

The kind or degree of neceſſity in Sacraments.

Firſt, Salvation was not tied to Sacraments in the Old Teſtament; not to circumciſion, in room of which we have baptiſme, and is by the Apoſtle called by the name of Baptiſme, *Col.* 2. 11. This is clear by the delay of it, according to Gods command, to the eighth day. If thoſe periſhed that died in the mean ſpace, which was the caſe of *Davids* child, their parents obedience of Gods command brought them to perdition. And ſalvation being not tied to Sacraments, but attainable without them, in the daies of the Old Teſtament, there is no cauſe to believe, that in the New Teſtament, there ſhould be reſtraint. The promulgation of the Goſpel did not ſtreighten grace, or make the way leſſe paſſeable to life and glory.

Secondly, They that are in Covenant with God, are upon that account in capacity of Salvation. This is plain; what advantage is gained by Covenant, if ſalvation be denyed? But ſuch are in Covenant, many ſuch that never were baptized. This is

as clear. *I will be thy God and the God of thy ſeed*; aſſoone as *Abraham* had a child, he had a child in Covenant, which howſoever Jeſuits, and after them Anabaptiſts would underſtand of the ſpiritual ſeed, yet God (as we ſee through the Old Teſtament) ownes them as his in a greater latitude. Thoſe to whom he gave the land of *Canaan*, are his ſeed there mentioned: But he gave not the Land of *Canaan* to the ſpiritual ſeed onely: Therefore they onely are not the ſeed there mentioned. The New Teſtament holds it out, in as great latitude, as I have abundantly ſhewed.

Thirdly, As *Abraham* the Father of the faithful came into a ſtate of juſtification, and ſalvation, ſo others may attain to it in like ſort; This is evident of it ſelf: But *Abraham* was in a ſtate of juſtification, without application of any Sacrament in his ſtate of uncircumciſion, and not of Circumciſion, as the Apoſtle argues, by computing the time, when it was ſaid of him, that *he believed the Lord, and it was accounted unto him for righteouſneſſe*, Rom. 4. 9, 10.

Fourthly, If Baptiſme be of this abſolute neceſſity, that regeneration is affixt to it, and none can be ſaved without it, then it is in mans power to ſave, and deſtroy, as is ſaid of *Nebuchadnezzar, whom he would he ſlew, and whom he would he kept alive*, Dan. 5. 19. which was the higheſt pitch of prerogative in regard of the outward man; ſo it may be ſaid of man reſpective to eternity of bliſſe, or miſery; according to them the meaneſt midwife may Baptize them ready to give up the Ghoſt, and ſave them, neglect them, and damne them. The Infant ſet out in type, *Ezek.* 16. And *Moſes* in the flags, lay ſadly at mans mercy for this fading life; but thouſands of infants, are alike at mercy, according to this tenent, for eternity.

Joh. 3. 5. vindicated.

The great objection which is made on the contrary, and that onely which is worthy of conſideration, is drawn from Chriſts words in conference with *Nicodemus*, Joh. 3. 5. *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* The water there, is meant of Baptiſme, that laver of regeneration, without this there is no entrance into heaven. When *Paul* ſaid, *Except theſe ſtay in the ſhip, ye cannot be ſaved*, Acts 27. 31. all will preſently underſtand that their abode in the ſhip was of abſolute neceſſity to ſafety; and ſo alſo baptiſme according to Chriſts words for eternity.

Anſw.

Anſw. Though it be not eaſy to determine, what is the right meaning, and genuine interpretation of thoſe words, yet it is of no great difficulty to vindicate them, from them that would faſten this ſenſe upon them, and gather this conſequence from them; And before I come to a full anſwer, I ſhall premiſe two things. 1. That it is a wonder that *Nicodemus* coming to our Saviour in the night, and as yet knowing nothing in the Myſtery of Chriſt, ſhould hear that from him, that others in the open light, and farre more knowing in Chriſtianity, could never hear from his mouth. 2. *Bellarmine* himſelf (as *Ameſius* doth obſerve) confeſſes (and if I do not much miſtake, *Suarez* ſomewhere) that at that time of Chriſts conference with *Nicodemus*, there was no ſuch abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſme. He puts the queſtion when baptiſme began to be neceſſary, and determines it in four propoſitions.[b] The third is, *That it was not neceſſary before the death of Chriſt, neither neceſſitate præcepti, or medii.* The fourth is, *that it was not neceſſary, neceſſitate medii, & præcepti, before the day of Pentecoſt.* And let any judge whether it be probable, inſtructing that novice in the faith, Chriſt would in the firſt place inform him, not what in preſent, but what afterwards would be of neceſſity, eſpecially ſeeing that after that time by him ſet down, when the abſolute neceſſity ſhould commence, we hear of no ſuch neceſſity of it. For more full ſatisfaction, I further anſwer,

[b] Baptiſmus Chriſti non fuit neceſſarius neceſſitate medii aut præcepti ante Chriſti mortem. Baptiſmus Chriſti cœpit eſſe neceſſarius neceſſitate medii & præcepti a die pentecoſtes.

Firſt, That text which names not Baptiſme, and cannot be concluded by an argument infallibly cogent to ſpeak of Baptiſme cannot enforce an abſolute neceſſity of it; This is cleare: But this text names not Baptiſme, neither is there any argument to conclude infallibly, that it ſpeaks of baptiſme; probabilities are mentioned, but no neceſſary concluding argument is by any produced.

Secondly, A Scripture-text carrying like colour, hath been urged for a like neceſſity for infants to receive the Lords Supper, *John* 6. 53. But this is agreed on all parties not to hold: This then how eagerly ſoever it is preſt, may fail likewiſe.

Thirdly, Either water there muſt be taken for Baptiſme of water, or elſe by way of Exegeſis to hold out the ſame thing that was expreſt before by the birth of the Spirit. If the latter will hold, as there are many parallel inſtances given, and multi-

tudes of Divines ſo interprete it (*Gerrard* in his common places reckons up many more then I have to conſult) then this text comes to nothing in this particular. And that this ſhould be the meaning, *Chamier* with fair probabilities argues, ſeeing in this ſenſe, the words bear an abſolute truth without any limitation. All being of a corrupt birth there is a neceſſity of a new birth, and that by the Spirit, there being no more births then that of the fleſh (which is corrupt) and that of the Spirit, that comes to heal corruption. If the former ſtand, that water muſt of neceſſity hold out Baptiſme of water, as Papiſts and Lutherans generally contend, and many Proteſtants yield, then either the words muſt be taken in an abſolute way, without any limit at all, or elſe with their juſt and due limitations; If limits muſt be put, then no abſolute unlimitted neceſſity can be concluded; and to underſtand it without any limit at all, our adverſaries themſelves ſee to be lyable to dangerous abſurdities.

Some therefore underſtand it of the Baptiſme of water, or ſome other that ſupplies the place and room of it; and it is on all hands granted, that *Baptiſmus flaminis & ſanguinis*, the Spirit, or blood in Martyrdome, may ſupply the room of it for ſalvation. And this *Chamier* ſaies, is the limit that *Arboreus* puts. Others underſtand it of Baptiſme of water, if it can be had, and it be not contemned and deſpiſed, and this *Chamier* ſaies is the limit that *Lombard*, *Bonaventure*, *Gorran*, *Carthuſian*, and *Villagadus* put to it. Others underſtand it of that regeneration, that is ordinarily by baptiſme of water, though by other meanes it may be wrought. And this limit *Alexander* of *Hales* puts to it, as *Ameſius* obſerves, either of actual Baptiſme, or elſe of the deſire of it, and this *Suarez* ſayes is the opinion of all Divines, and charges it for an hereſy to hold, that none of years can be ſaved unleſſe actually baptized, notwithſtanding their earneſt deſire of it; and in his time, he ſaies, one *Michael Baius* a Divine of *Lovain* held it, But as (he ſaies) *Pius* 5. and *Gregorius* 13. in their letters publiſhed did condemne it. And this text being ſubject to ſo many limitations, our adverſaries being judges; I hope I may without any juſt exception adde one, that it be underſtood of men of years, ſuch as *Nicodemus* was, to whom it was ſpoken; ſeeing ſo many helps are provided for men of yeares in the want of Baptiſme, it is altogether unreaſonable to leave Infants in

ſuch

ſuch exigents, as to be irremedileſly under damnation for eternity, when it is not in their power to make proviſion of it, and ſo are holpen by *Lombard*, and thoſe of that party: Any man may be their Compurgitor that they are not guilty of contempt of it. Beſides this Text there are many high ſpeeches alledged out of ſome of the Ancient for the neceſſity of Baptiſme, and heavy doom of thoſe that paſſe out of this world in the want of it. But theſe are not onely under the diſlike of Proteſtants, but of thoſe that theſe lay claim to be of their own party. *Bernard*, Epiſt. 77. is large againſt them; and *Voſſius* hath a full quotation out of *Petrus Bleſſenſis*, who was *Bernards* contemporary. [c] *The Spirit and water ſufficeth; The Spirit and blood ſufficeth, if inſtant neceſſity, and not contempt of Religion depriveth of Water. The Spirit alone may ſuffice, for his teſtimony hath weight in it.* And whereas *Auſtin* of all other is moſt frequently quoted for this rigid ſentence, as being in name moſt eminent, my author ſets *Auſtine* againſt *Auſtin*, having in his 5th. Book againſt Donatiſts theſe words: [d] *Again, and again, conſidering I find, that not onely ſuffering for the Name of Chriſt, may ſupply what is wanting in Baptiſme, but alſo faith, and converſion of the heart, if peradventure ſtreights of time will not permit the celebration of the Sacrament of Baptiſme.* But to hold the Reader no longer in this controverſy; in avoiding the Popiſh neceſſity of Sacraments, for a more diſtinct underſtanding of this neceſſity of Sacraments, I ſhall lay down ſome rules.

[c] Sufficit Spiritus & aqua: Sufficit Spiritus & ſanguis, ſi aquam non excluſit contemptus Religionis, ſed articulus neceſſitatis: Sufficiet ſolus Spiritus, quia teſtimonium ipſius pondus habet.

[d] Etiam atque etiam conſiderans in venio, non tantum paſſionem pro nomine Chriſti, id quod ex Baptiſmo deerat, poſſe ſupplere, ſed etiam fidem converſionemque cordis, ſi forte ad celebrandum myſterium baptiſmi, in anguſtiis temporum ſufficere non poteſt. Neque enim latro ille pro nomine Chriſti crucifixus eſt, ſed pro meritis facinorum ſuorum; nec quia credidit paſſus eſt, ſed dum patitur credit: quantum itaque valeat etiam ſine viſibili Sacramento baptiſmi quod ait Apoſtolus. Rom. 10, 10 Corde creditur ad juſtitiam, ore autem fit confeſſio ad ſalutem, in illo latrone declaratum eſt: ſed tunc impletur inviſibiliter cum myſterium baptiſmi, non contemptus Religionis, ſed articulus neceſſitatis excludit.

SECT.

SECT. II.

Rules for a right underſtanding of the neceſſity of Sacraments.

Rules for a right underſtanding of the neceſſity of Sacraments.

1. Sacraments are ſtanding Ordinances.

FIrſt, *that Sacraments both of the Old, and New Teſtament, are ſtanding Ordinances, to be obſerved of the people of God, not barely in the generation in which they were ſet up, but in all ſucceſſive generations; ſo that there is an abiding and laſting neceſſity in them.* This is in that punctuall way ſet down in Scriptures reſpective to each Sacrament, as though the Spirit of God would let us know, that he did foreſee a generation ready to ariſe, to throw them off, and live above them, or elſe to vilifie them, as unneceſſary, indifferent and arbitrary. For circumciſion, ſee *Gen.* 17. 12,13. *He that is eight dayes old, ſhall be circumciſed among you, every man-child in your generations: he that is born in the houſe, or bought with money of any ſtranger which is not of thy ſeed, he that is born in thy houſe, and he that is bought with thy money muſt needs be circumciſed, and my Covenant ſhall be in your fleſh for an everlaſting Covenant.* God layes there a neceſſity upon it, a laſting neceſſity in all ſucceeding generations of that people to be obſerved; and when *Moſes* ſeveral generations afterwards did as we have heard omit it; upon what reaſon we have nothing but conjecture. We ſee, *Exod.* 4. 24. how much God was diſpleaſed at it. And for the Paſſeover, *Exod.* 12. 13. we find a like laſting injunction, *This day ſhall be unto you for a memoriall, and you ſhall keep it a feaſt unto the Lord, thorowout your generations: you ſhall keep it a feaſt by an Ordinance for ever*: repeated again, ver. 17. It was an Ordinance that no Jew in any generation might antiquate, or put a period unto. It muſt laſt as long as they remained a diſtinct generation unto God, even till Chriſt (in whoſe hands are times and ſeaſons, in whom there is neither Jew nor Greek) ſhould be the end of it. As to New Teſtament-Sacraments the Scripture is as clear; when Chriſt gave commiſſion for diſcipling Nations, and baptizing them, for their encouragement in the work, he promiſes his preſence unto the end of the world: The work is to continue as long as Chriſts preſence in the work continues: But Chriſts preſence according

according to promiſe, is to continue with them in diſcipling of Nations, and baptizing them, being diſcipled, unto the end of the world. I am not ignorant of the Critical obſervation that is made of the phraſe, αἰὼν, *ſæculi*, by reaſon of the various acceptation of it in Scriptures, endeavouring to have it to be underſtood of the end of that age, in which thoſe lived to whom Chriſt ſpake. But neither the parallel uſe of the word by *Matthew*, nor the context will bear that evaſion. For the parallel uſe of the phraſe by *Matthew* four places may be inſtanced in, three in one Chapter, *Matth.* 13. 39. The harveſt is the end of the world, verſ. 40. *As therefore the tares are gathered and burnt in the fire, ſo ſhall it be in the end of this world*, verſ. 49. *So ſhall it be at the end of the world, the Angels ſhall come forth, and ſever the wicked from among the juſt*, Matth. 24. 3. *Tell us when ſhall theſe things be? and what ſhall be the ſign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?* In all theſe places the phraſe is the ſame, and the words can be underſtood in none of them with that limitation: And that the context will not bear it, enough may be gathered from that which I have ſaid, Treatiſe of the Covenant, pag. 117. For a more clear diſcovery of the words, we know that there is a double period of ages, or generations in Scripture: One at Chriſts firſt coming, when an end was put to Circumciſion, and the Paſſeover; of this the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *Heb.* 9. 26. *But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf*: at the end of that world Chriſt dyed. The other is at his ſecond coming, and this is the end of the world here mentioned; and upon this account Dr. *Reynolds* in his Sermons upon *Hoſ.* 14. interprets that of Chriſt concerning the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, that it ſhall never be forgiven in this life, nor in the life to come, *Matth.* 12. 32. of the age in which Chriſt lived, and now was near to an end, and the age that ſhould follow from his death till his ſecond coming; neither under the Old, nor New Teſtament, or Covenant, can that ſin find remiſſion. Till Chriſts ſecond return, a Miniſtery, and Baptiſme muſt ſtill remain. For the Lords Supper, Scripture-teſtimony is as clear, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. *As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do ſhew forth the Lords death till he come.* If we can believe a coming of Chriſt for a temporal Reign, before the time of his coming to the general Judgment, I ſhall believe that may be called the conſummation,

end

end or finiſhing of this generation, and then a period may be put to theſe and other Ordinances. But howſoever that will anſwer, or fail mens expectations, certain it is, that it is the mind of Chriſt that they ſhall ſtand, till the time that he doth come; and then his mind will be further known. The practice of the Church hath hitherto anſwered theſe teſtimonies. All ages of the Church (as we know) held up Circumciſion till Chriſts time, and in Chriſts time it was in uſe, as Chriſt teſtifies, *Joh.* 7. 22. and he ſubmits to it in his own perſon, *Luk.* 2. and ſo we may ſay of the Paſſeover notwithſtanding ſome diſuſe, the godly ever knew it to be in force, or elſe, as piety broke forth, they had not ſtill reaſſumed it. And Chriſt dying (as we have heard) at the end of that world, the day that he was to dye, he held a Paſſeover. In New Teſtament-times not onely through the Apoſtles times, but to this time, Baptiſme and the Lords Supper have continued. Reaſons may alſo enforce this as to Sacraments in general, ſo to Baptiſme and the Lords Supper in particular. 1. The Covenant is to be kept for ever; there is no diſpenſation at any time for the breach of it; The ſeals then which by Divine inſtitution are appointed as appendants to it, muſt be continued. As reaſon it ſelf may ſpeak enough for the validity of this conſequence, ſo the Text of Scripture likewiſe confirms it, *Gen.* 17. 7, 13. compared; *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me, and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, in their generations for an everlaſting Covenant; to be a God unto thee, and unto thy ſeed after thee. He that is born in thy houſe, and he that is bought with thy money, muſt needs be circumciſed; and my Covenant ſhall be in your fleſh, for an everlaſting Covenant.* 2. We have as much need as ever, this generation as any other generation, to have our weakneſſes ſupported, our faith ſtrengthened; there is not any benefit ever gained by a Sacrament, but as primitive times did, ſo we may reap ſpiritual advantage by it. For reaſons for the perpetuity of Baptiſme, Mr. *Baxter*, pag. 341, 342. of his Treatiſe of Infants Church-membership and Baptiſme, hath furniſhed the Reader with plenty; of ten that he urges, I judg nine at leaſt to be unqueſtionable; to which I ſhall adde onely one, and that is ſuch a one, that with weakneſſe enough hath been brought by ſome for warranty of the diſuſe of it. If the gift of the Spirit be laſting, and continuing in the Church, then the uſe of Baptiſme is laſting and continuing likewiſe: But the gift of the Spirit is laſting and continuing: *Ergo.* The aſſumption, that the

Spirit

Spirit is a lasting gift, I suppose none will question. The *major* Proposition is grounded on the Apostles words, *Act.* 10.47. *Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* When others do reason from the having of the Spirit, to the needlesnesse of Baptisme, the Apostle disputes in the direct opposite manner, where the Spirit is, there Baptisme is not to be denyed. For the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, we may likewise evince the constant standing necessity of it: 1. The death of Christ is to be shewed forth constantly, and every way preached: This is a shewing forth of the death of Christ, a means of declaring of him crucified, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. 2. The memorial of Christ is to be preserved, and endeared; This is for his memorial, done in remembrance of him, *Matth.* 26. *Luke* 22. 1 *Cor.* 11. If the deliverance from *Egypt* must be kept as a memorial for ever in that Ordinance of the Passeover, then much more the remembrance of Christ in his Supper. 3. Every way of Communion with Christ is to be preserved, and upheld; This is a way of Communion with Christ, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. 4. Union with the Members of Christ is to be studied; This is the way of our union with the Members of Christ, and therefore this is to be continued. I shall not enlarge much for refutation of Objections of those that in our times are contrarily minded, seeing I have read little of any thing that they have to say; a noise is abroad of such (with whom I have had small converse) that cry down rebaptisme, by the denyal of Baptisme; as *Lucian* made it his businesse to confute Polytheisme, by bringing in of Atheisme; made himself merry with the Pagans rabble of gods, by believing no God; Opposition of errour ordinarily leads men into opposite errors; but a better way may be found for the overthrow of a double Baptisme, then by the nullifying of all baptisme. One God asserted by the Apostle will overthrow Atheisme and Polytheisme, and one Baptisme asserted by him in the same place will overthrow Anabaptisme. But these are not the first founders of this opinion: *Austin* speaking of the *Manichees*, Heres. 46. saith, [e] *That they hold, that Baptisme with water is not at all usefull for salvation, neither do they think it meet to baptize any that they deceive*: and speaking of other Hereticks, Heres. 49. *Seleuciani*, and *Hermiani*, he saith, [f] *They do not hold any baptisme with water.* And *Philastrius* (who as *Bellarmine* witnesses *de*

[e] Baptismum in aqua nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis adferre, nec quenquam eorum, quos decipiunt, baptizandum putant.

[f] Baptismum in aquâ non accipiunt.

Scriptor. Eccleſiaſticus, pag. 93. wrote before *Auſtin* of Hereſies, and is quoted by *Auſtin*) ſaith, [g] *Seleucus, and Hermius the hereticks hold, that the ſoul conſiſts of fire, and the Spirit. Theſe uſe not Baptiſme, by reaſon of John Baptiſts words, He ſhall baptize you with the Spirit, and fire. Socinus* in this laſt age hath revived this opinion, and ſaith, [h] *That Baptiſme with water hath no command from Chriſt, or at leaſt no perpetual, and univerſal command.* The Reader if he pleaſe may ſee the Scriptures by him wreſted, and Reaſons by him brought, vindicated, and anſwered by *Voſſius de neceſſitate Baptiſmi*, pag 381. to pag. 388.

[g] Seleucus & Hermius hæretici animas hominum de igne & Spiritu eſſe exiſtimantes, iſti baptiſmo non utuntur, propter verbum hoc quod dixit Johannes Baptiſta: ipſe vos baptizabit in Spiritu & igne.

[h] Baptiſmum aquæ non habere præceptum Chriſti, aut ſaltem non perpetuum & univerſale.

Refert Voſſius.

2. *Rule.* Initiatory Sacraments are of greater neceſſity then thoſe that follow.

Secondly, *There appears a greater degree of neceſſity of the initiatory leading Sacrament, which ſerves for our firſt admiſſion (whether in the dayes of the Old, or New Teſtament) into the Church of God, then of the other that ſucceeds for our further ſtrength and growth.* Both of them are neceſſary, neither of them are arbitrary; but in caſe we may enter compariſon, the greater weight lyes on the former, as may ſeveral wayes appear unto us:

Arguments evincing this neceſſity.

Firſt, There was a leading Sacrament for initiation many years in the Church, before any was ordained to follow after it. Circumciſion was given in charge 400 years before the Paſſeover; that of Circumciſion was not long after *Abrahams* call, and the promiſe of the Land of *Canaan* being before *Iſaac's* birth, which was onely 25 years diſtant from his firſt removal out of *Haran* for *Canaan*, as appears, *Gen.* 12. 4. & 21. 5. compared. The Paſſeover was given in charge upon *Iſraels* departure out of *Egypt*, Exod. 12. one year before the Law was given, which was 430 yeares after the promiſe to *Abraham*, Gal. 3. 17. All this time the ſeed of *Abraham* were entred into the Church by Circumciſion, and enjoyed no other Sacrament properly ſo called.

Secondly, Gods diſpleaſure never ſhewed it ſelf ſo high, upon the neglect of the Paſſeover, as upon the neglect of Circumciſion, though the penalty threatned is the ſame in both, *Gen.* 17. 14. *Numb.* 9. 13. God never appeared, that we read, for the death of any, upon that account, as he did for the death

of

of *Moses*, upon the neglect of Circumcision. Reverend Mr. *Cotton* makes the like danger to be in the neglect of Infant-Baptisme, as we may see in the Preface to his Book on that subject.

Thirdly, To be utterly out of the Church, must needs be of greater danger, then to want some one Ordinance in the Church. *Out of the Church there is no salvation*, is an old Rule, which *Acts* 2. 47. *Ephes.* 2. 12. *Jer.* 10. 25. abundantly confirm, that is, without it, and all right of relation to it, and to be without right, and to live in the neglect and despisal of it, (being convinced of the necessity of it) are alike dangerous.

¡Extra Ecclesiam nulla Salus.

Fourthly, No such brand can lye on the want of the one, as the other; none equal to that of uncircumcision, can be fastened upon the want of any other priviledge: But lest excusing *à tanto*, I should be thought to excuse *à toto*, in comparing the danger, I should be thought to deny any danger in the want of this later, I shall cease.

3. *Rule.* The Lords Supper may occasionally be delayed.

Thirdly, *As the Passover in Israel, both in the wilderness, and the Land of Canaan, was sometimes discontinued, and not in the time prescribed observed, by reason of the Churches disorder, and present unpreparedness of the people; so likewise it may haply sometimes fall out in like occasion, to be thought needfull for a time to delay the Lords Supper.*: For the disuse of the Passeover by the children of *Israel* in the Wilderness more happily may be said, then for the time when they were settled in Canaan, seeing Circumcision at that time was also discontinued, whether by special command from God, or upon inevitable necessity by reason of their often removals, for which the knife of Circumcision would have disabled, or their sinful neglect, I will not determine; and yet more is said for omission of it in that time, then perhaps can fairly be defended. A Reverend Divine saith, *He wonders why omission of the Passeover in the wilderness is alledged; for after the first celebration thereof, all future celebrations were by expresse and plain command to be onely in the Land of Canaan*; quoting *Exod.* 13. 4, 5. with an *&c. Deut.* 16. from ver. 1. *usq; ad* 8. and confirming it at large with the authority of *Rivet*, inserting his words. But with due reverence to men of their eminency, I may suggest also my wondrings, how it can be said, that by expresse and plain command all future celebrations of the Passeover, after the first, were onely to be in the Land of

Canaan, ſeeing, *Numb.* 9. 1. a famous Paſſeover was obſerved in the wilderneſſe of *Sinai*, in the firſt moneth of the ſecond year after they were come out of the Land of *Egypt*. If it be ſaid, that this Paſſeouer in the Wilderneſſe was by eſpecial command from God, and otherwiſe ſhould not have been obſerved till they came into the Land of *Canaan*, as *Ainſworth* on *Numb.* 9. 1. in favour of this opinion doth indeed ſay, *The cauſe why God commanded them to keep the Paſſeover in the Wilderneſſe was*, (ſaith he) *for that by the firſt inſtitution they were bound to keep it when they came into the Land of Canaan, and therefore without ſpeciall warranty could not have kept it in the deſert.* I anſwer, That Circumciſion when it was firſt taken up again in the Wilderneſſe, was by eſpecial command from God, *Joſh.* 5. 2. and in all probability the Paſſeover that then was obſerved with it, ver. 10. was by like command; which doth not argue, but that by vertue of the primitive inſtitution they might have kept it; neither is there any Text urged evincing any ſuch limit to the Land of *Canaan*: for the place quoted, *Deut.* 16. 2, 5, 6. verſes, onely looks that way, and the words are theſe, *Thou ſhalt therefore ſacrifice the Paſſeover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd in the place in which the Lord ſhall chooſe to place his Name there; thou mayeſt not ſacrifice the Paſſeover within any of thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee; But at the place which the Lord thy God ſhall chooſe to place his Name in, there thou ſhalt ſacrifice the Paſſeover at even, at the going down of the Sun, at the ſeaſon that thou cameſt forth out of Egypt*: and there the place prohibited is not all places out of *Canaan*, but their own gates, though in *Canaan*. And the place preſcribed is not *Canaan*, but the place whereſoever God ſhould fix his Tabernacle; upon the ſame account no ſacrifice could have been with warranty offered in the Wilderneſſe, but onely in *Canaan*, there is the like reaſon, and like Law for both, *Deut.* 12. 5, 6, 7. *But unto the place which the Lord your God ſhall chooſe out of all your Tribes to put his Name there, even unto his habitation ſhall ye ſeek, and thither thou ſhalt come, and thither ye ſhall bring your burnt-offerings, and your ſacrifices, and your tythes, and heave-offerings of your hand, and your vowes, and your free-will offerings, and the firſtlings of your herds and of your flocks, and there ye ſhall eat before the Lord your God.* Yet we find ſacrifice offered in the Wilderneſſe, and there they did eat before the Lord, as is plain, *Levit.* 10. 1. ver. 16,

Deut. 16. 2, 5, 6. vindicated.

to

to the end. As for *Exod.* 12.25. & 13.45. where the command for celebration of the Paſſeover is given in charge to be obſerved, when they came into the Land of *Canaan*, They being to have *Canaan* by the gift of God for their habitation, mention is made of that place, where it was in all their generations to be obſerved (and no notice taken of any ſuch halt, that they were to make in the way, which their ſin did afterwards occaſion): But it is no prohibition of it in the way thither, or warranty for omiſſion, when the time was thus protracted for their arrival there; having the Tabernacle with them, they had their liberty for obſervation of it: which is clear to me, from *Deut.* 12. 10, 11. *When ye go over Jordan and dwell in the Land, which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit, and when he giveth you reſt from all your enemies round about, ſo that ye dwell in ſafety, then there ſhall be a place, which the Lord your God ſhall chooſe, to cauſe his Name to dwell there, thither ſhall ye bring all that I command you.* But before they paſſed *Jordan*, while *Moſes* was with them, as you have heard, they had their offerings, which is further plain, *Numb.* 16. 17, 18, 46. 47. and ſo might have had their Paſſeover likewiſe. As the Paſſeover was diſcontinued in the Wilderneſſe, ſo it was alſo oftentimes in the Land of *Canaan*, we read of no more Paſſeovers then one, that was kept by *Joſhuah*. *Joſiah* in the eighth year of his Reign, began to ſeek after the God of his Fathers; and in the twelfth year he began to purge *Judah*, and *Jeruſalem* from the high places, and the groves, and the carved Images, and the molten Images, 2 *Chron.* 34. 3, 4. But it was in the eighteenth year of his Reign that he could reach to keep a Paſſeover, Chap. 35. 19. *Hezekiah*, as appears, haſted to keep a Paſſeover, yet durſt not be over-haſty, he could not keep it on the day which originally in the Law was appointed. But upon advice put it off to the ſecond moneth, becauſe the Prieſts had not ſanctified themſelves ſufficiently, 2 *Chro.* 30. 3. *Ezra* kept a Paſſeover upon the return out of the Captivity, *Ezra* 6. 19. and the reaſon is given, verſ. 20, 21. *For the Prieſts and Levites were purified together, all of them were pure, and killed the Paſſeover for all the children of the captivity, and for their brethren the Prieſts, and for themſelves; and the children of Iſrael, which were come again out of Captivity, and all ſuch as had ſeparated themſelves unto them, from the filthineſſe of the Heathen of the Land to ſeek the Lord God of Iſrael, did eat.* Had not the Prieſts

Prieſts and Levites been thus purified, and the people thus ſeparated, the Paſſeover it appeares had been longer delayed. As theſe ſaw neceſſitating occaſion for omiſſion of this Ordinance, which yet is not charged as their ſin; ſo may alſo the Miniſters of Chriſt ſee like occaſion for delay of adminiſtration of the Lords Supper. And there is advantage on their part, ſeeing there was a preſcript time in the Law for the obſervation of the one, but no limited time in the Goſpel for the adminiſtration of the other. Sometimes a Miniſter by providence is caſt upon ſuch a people, that ſcarce three are able to diſcern what they have in hand, when they are about this duty, and therefore he ſees no more reaſon to call them to it, then Chriſt ſaw to call his diſciples newly choſen unto private faſtings, or the Apoſtle to give meat to babes; edification is their great buſineſſe, their whole buſineſſe; they may ſtay the time that they may adminiſter it to edification; ſometimes it evidently appeares that the rent is in a way to be made ſo great by their adminiſtration, through the obſervance of ſome working errour upon the judgment in others, that are ſo principled, that none but high Saints are for this Ordinance, that they ſee danger in proceeding in it. And though I do not doubt, but that it is often forborn out of ſinful neglect, and by truly conſciencious Miniſters, ſometimes out of over-much indulgence of their brethrens weakneſſe, and their own over-rigid principles: yet as I do believe that all conſciencious Paſtours, who for ſome ſpace of time forbear, do judge that there is cauſe for ſuch forbearance, ſo I do believe that upon ſome occaſions *pro hic & nunc*, it may juſtly be forborn. And whatſoever exception is taken againſt Arguments drawn from Analogy, as not concluding, of which I need to ſay no more then I have already ſpoken, yet I ſhall conclude, that this which is drawn from the Paſſeover (which is rather from example, then analogy) is cogent. If that of the *London*-Divines in their *Divine Right of Church-Government*, pag. 20, 21. (quoted and approved by Reverend Mr. *Jeanes*, pag. 21. of his Treatiſe) be of weight, *That whatſoever actions were done by Saints recorded in Scripture, upon ſuch grounds as are of morall, perpetual, and common concernment to one perſon as well as to another, to one Church as well as to another, theſe actions are obligatory to all, and a rule to after-generations*, then this Argument, grounded on the example of ſuch actions, is not to be charged

as

as not concluding; yea, though we had no ſuch Example to lead us, (as perhaps they had none, to be a precedent to them) yet thoſe reaſons which led them, or thoſe that are equivalent, may lead us likewiſe.

Fourthly, *There is no definitive time in the Goſpel for obſervation, nor any preciſe determinate preſcript for the frequency of the Lords Supper.* But when and how often Chriſtian prudence muſt order, yet being an holy exerciſe, the day which we are to keep holy calls for it, being the Lords Supper, what time ſo meet as the Lords day? The whole community of the faithful being intereſted in it, it is to be obſerved at the time of their publick meetings, which occaſionally may be at other times, but muſt be at that time. And in caſe breaking of bread, *Act.* 20. 7. be meant of the Lords Supper, (as moſt affirm, and I will not oppoſe) it is out of queſtion. But yet I cannot think that every holy duty is alwaies to be the work of every holy meeting, ſo the word ſhould never be preached, nor prayer publickly made without a Sacrament; I believe there is ſomewhat extraordinary in a Sacrament, comparative to other duties, as there is in a Faſt. And though the Law for the Paſſeover, and day of Atonement, tye not us to annual obſervations onely of Sacraments, and Faſts, as it tyed the Jewes; yet me thinks it ſpeaks ſomewhat more then ordinary in them, and that Faſts and Sacraments are not to be done in that frequency, as daily addreſſes to God in prayer, and our hearing from God in his Word. And though I ſubſcribe to Mr. *Pemble* and others, that the Apoſtles words, [*As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup*] implyes that it ſhould be often. A Chriſtian ſhould not ſeldome in his life partake of this Ordinance, yet I ſuppoſe it doth allow, if not imply longer intermiſſion then is to be in other duties. The primitive times, perhaps in ſome places at leaſt, made this Ordinance over-common, celebrating it (as is ſaid) every day, in other places every Lords day. Mr. *Pemble* who religiouſly pleads for the frequent celebration of it, ſayes, *It is true, that as in other, ſo in this Divine inſtitution, Satan hath done much by his malicious policy to corrupt mens hearts in the obſervation of it. When the Sacrament was adminiſtred often, he brought it into contempt by the commonneſſe of it: Now that it is adminiſtred ſeldome, through ignorance it is thought unneceſſary.* How truly his obſervation is verified, we ſee in two extreams into which different parties

4. *Rule.* There is no preſcript for the time, or frequency of the obſervation of the Lords Supper.

parties are run at this preſent time: One part breaking bread almoſt at all their meetings, and make no more of it then common bread, looking after no Miniſter ſet apart for that work, not ſo much as of their own making, any one whom they will call a gifted diſciple (and ſuch with them is every dipt diſciple) is ſet up for it; They act it while ſome walk, ſome talk in their preſence, with leſſe reverence then befits grave perſons at common meals. I fear there was never more rudeneſſe in *Corinth*, then may be ſeen here in Sacramental obſervations. On the other hand, the Sacrament is almoſt forgotten, and looked upon as a Ceremony antiquated, and obſolete; Chriſtian prudence ſhould interpoſe, and diſcern a mean between both. To quicken and put us on againſt this laſt, of which the moſt had need, inſtead of a Book of Canons, or compulſory Lawes. Let us, 1. Affect our ſoules with an ardent love of Chriſt, and then we ſhall not be ſo ſlack in celebration of this memorial of him: We will keep up the memory of an endeared friend, this way Chriſt hath commended to endear his memory to us. If love be ſuch as it ought, we ſhall not deſire that it be ſeldome, if it may be poſſibly often. *Peter* had it three times in charge from Chriſt, to feed his Lambs, to feed his ſheep; how often he muſt preach Chriſt he is not told, that is left to his love: *If thou loveſt me, feed my ſheep.* Love would not let him be ſlothfull. 2. Let us take into conſideration our own neceſſities, of which here we may have ſupplyes, firſt our want of humiliation, and heart-breaking, how ſlight and overly is all our feeling, and ſenſe of ſin? if let alone are we not in danger to grow paſt feeling? which was the caſe of the Heathen, when they had arrived at the greateſt height of wickedneſſe, *Epheſ.* 4. 19. Here is an hammer for that purpoſe, when once the Law hath diſcovered, by the light that is given, that we have ſinned. No way to this for the aggravation of it. Here we ſee Gods deteſtation of ſin, that would not ſpare it in his onely Son, as he ſpared not the Angels that ſinned, but having no Mediatour to bear it for them, they bore the puniſhment of it in their own perſons; ſo he ſpared not his own Son, when he had taken upon him our ſin. Here we ſee the deſert of ſin in all thoſe torments which Chriſt bore for us. If we would know ſin, and be ſenſible of wrath, ſtudy the Sacrament, the dead ſoul may be here awakened. Secondly, our ſpiritual weakneſſes and wants, which I ſhall ſet out in

Directions for our guidance about it.

Mr.

Mr. *Pembles* words, *Let them look inward, and ſee how great need they have of many and often confirmations of their faith, renovations of their repentance, of ſtirring up the graces of God in their ſoules, to adde an edge, an eagerneſſe to all ſpiritual affections after holineſſe, to get unto themſelves the moſt powerfull provocations unto obedience. Every one that hath grace knowes how frequently the power thereof is impaired by temptations, weakened by wordly diſtractions, even of our lawful employment, and over-maſtered by the force of ſinful luſts, ſo that they muſt needs diſcover a great deal of ignorance in their ſpiritual eſtate, that feel not in their own ſoules a proneneſſe to aſtoniſhment, as well in their ſoules, as in their bodies, at leaſt they bewray intolerable careleſneſſe, that finding the emptineſſe and leanneſſe of their ſoules, yet neglect to repair often to this holy Table, whereon is ſet forth the bread of life, whereof when they have eaten, their ſpirit may come again,* 1 Sam. 31. 12. *their hearts may be ſtrengthened, their ſoules may be repleniſhed, as with marrow and fatneſſe.* Theſe conſiderations may quicken our appetites after this ſpiritual food. And ſuch a meal extraordinary, with the help of our ordinary refreſhments, in hearing, prayer, and meditation, may carry us on more then 40 dayes, towards our heavenly Manſion. That we haſten not too faſt on the other hand, Let us take into conſideration our inabilities for a ſuitable preparation, and fitneſſe for addreſſe to this Ordinance; we have faſted ſo long in courſe, that we have ſcarce known what humiliation of our ſoules in faſting is; yea, ſome would be every day at it, as we can riſe in our ſpirits to the extraordinary weight of it, and fit our ſoules with ſuitable preparations for it. Theſe that I have named are the beſt gages, that I know, to regulate us in it, that in over-eager haſte in duties extraordinary, we do not run our ſelves out of breath; nor in over-much ſloth, give our ſelves over to faintneſſe, and leanneſſe.

SECT. III.

A Corollary from the former Doctrine.

Men called to the Sacrament may not otherwiſe then upon weighty reaſons abſent themſelves from it.

THen it will follow by way of neceſſary inference from this conſideration of the neceſſity of Sacraments; that, *When Sacraments are diſpenſed, Chriſtians ſhould ſee weighty reaſons, ſuch in which they may have confidence, that they will bear them out at the day of Judgment, for their omiſſion of them.* This duty is in the number of affirmative precepts, which alwayes bind, A man is never from under the obligation of that Precept, *Do this in remembrance of me*; though it doth not bind to all times, A man is not to be ever in the doing of it, and he is never to be found in the neglect of it; *Loco & tempore debitis*, in due time, and place they muſt be done. A journey would have diſpenſed with a man for abſence from the Paſſeover, ſo it will (when neceſſity of a mans calling makes it neceſſary) from the Lords Supper; ſo alſo will ſickneſſes, impriſonments, or like providences. But when the ſervant comes, and calls, and ſayes, All things are made ready, then take thou heed how thou makeſt excuſes. They that were called to the wedding Feaſt might have pleaded, that other buſineſſes lay upon them, that they could not alwayes attend weddings: But when the King ſends, and ſayes, All is ready, come, there is no time for other occaſions to be lookt after. It were an endleſſe work, to find out the reaſons that men frame for abſenting themſelves. Some ſee that it is a duty above them, neither their knowledge, nor their life doth anſwer to that which is required in a Communicant; and ſo deſpair of coming up to it, and therefore keep off, leſt they ſhould (as they fear) encreaſe their judgment: In caſe theſe ſpeak out of a ſerious conſideration of the work, with a ſad reflexion on themſelves, upon a diligent ſcrutiny into their hearts, and wayes; and ſo take a day over for it, and in the mean time digge for knowledge, as for hid treaſures, and do ſtrengthen their reſolutions to withſtand all temptations to ſin, they are by all meanes to be encouraged, and holpen; every Chriſtian of ſtrength ſhould commiſerate theſe weak ſoules. But in caſe they clearly ſee all to be ſo, as we have ſaid, and reſolve to let all alone, as a man that ſees himſelf near to a bankrupt, regards not whether

Excuſes for abſence from the Lords Table removed.

end

end goes forward. This is then a ſad and ſaddening reaſon; It lyes upon theſe to take their ſtate and condition into further conſideration, that by the good hand of God it may be better with them. To provoke theſe to further care of their eternal ſtate, I ſhall put to them theſe queſtions:

The excuſe of unfitnetie examined.

First, What is it that thou doſt reſpective to other duties, the duty of Prayer? doſt thou pray ever, or never? reſolving to keep back from the Sacrament, doſt thou reſolve wholly to forbear to call on the Name of the Lord? If thou reſolveſt in this way, and periſheſt, thou haſt upon thee the brand of the wicked, *Pſal.* 14. 4. They call not on the Name of the Lord; and the ſentence of the wrath of God, *Jer.* 10. 25. If thou canſt pray with hopes to be heard, thou mayeſt then have hopes to receive the Sacrament, to be accepted; and if ſo qualified, as to be out of hopes in the one, then thou art altogether void of hopes in both. *Paul* ſpeaks much of the danger of an unworthy Communicant, which ſhould awaken all that intend to receive. And multitude of Scripture-Texts ſpeak the ſame of men that pray in ſuch a condition: What can be worſe then for the Lord to ſay, when they pray, *he will not hear, he will hide his eyes*? Iſa. 1. 15. to reproach their praying, by the name of *howling*? Hoſ. 7. 14. to account it an *abomination*? Prov. 28. 9.

Secondly, If it be above thy hopes to ſit down with acceptance at the Lords Table, Is it not then as much above thy hopes to ſit down in heavenly places with Chriſt Jeſus? If thy ſtate of ignorance, unbelief, and wickedneſſe keep thee from participation with viſible Church-members in this Ordinance in the way, how wilt thou be fit to joyn with the Church Triumphant in glory? Thou muſt be made *meet for heaven*, Col. 1. 12. if thou come to heaven: and thou art meet to partake of this Supper, when thou art meet for heaven; unfit for this, unfit for ſalvation.

Thirdly, If the danger be great to come unworthily, is it any leſſe not to come at all? It is hard to determine of the ſins of deſpiſing, and prophaning the worſhip of the Lord, whether is greater, or leſſer; Judge whether are in better caſe, thoſe mentioned, *Matth.* 22. 7. or him that is mentioned, ver. 12, 13. and then thou wilt ſee that there remains nothing, but to endeavour to be ſuch a one that may come, otherwiſe thou

thou periſheſt in coming, and periſheſt in abſenting.

Others profeſſe their willingneſſe, and readineſſe to come, in caſe they could have things to their minds when they come; But things being as they are, they are compelled to forbear. Now theſe keep off out of ſeveral principles, which in caſe they be well laid, they may juſtifie their practice; but in caſe they are found erroneous, their way muſt needs be faulty. Theſe are in two extreams.

Want of a wonted Liturgy may not excuſe.

Some would come in caſe the ancient Liturgy were held, and the Book of Common Prayer anciently in uſe in *England* might be obſerved; in the mean time till that be, they do forbear. To this I ſay, It is wonder how ſo much ſtreſſe is laid on this as to invite to the worſhip of God in caſe they may enjoy it, and to perſwade a total neglect, if they want it. Give me leave to deſire of theſe (there being ſo many that harp upon this ſtring) a few things for ſatisfaction, that ſo we may either prevail with them, to hold Communion with us, or elſe that we may forbear with them.

First, Is not this an honour far above all, that is due to any labour, or compoſure of man, to turn the ſcale in this manner, whether an inſtituted worſhip of God muſt ſtand or fall? An humane work it is, this cannot be denyed; we are to receive nothing as Divinely inſpired, upon pain of adding to the Word of God, but that which is contained in the words of the Scripture. For this, ſo to ſteer my courſe, that when my liberty of uſe of it is granted, I will worſhip; and when denyed, I will forbear; This I ſay is too high an honour, a work of man is thus made of the very eſſence and being of an Ordinance of God. *Hezekiah* indeed put that honour upon the Altar at *Hieruſalem*, that he would admit no ſacrifice elſewhere, (as *Rabſhakeh* could obſerve to his reproach, *Iſa.* 37. 7.) But he had a Word of God for it, *Deut.* 12. 5, 6. To give the like honour to this book without a word from God, is to idolize it; Theſe opinions of it, were that which outed it.

Secondly, Is it for the excellency of the work it ſelf, that thou thus prizeſt it? or from the Sanction, that from higher powers hath been put upon it, the Law that did eſtabliſh it? It muſt needs be one of theſe, that moves thee to put ſuch an honour upon it. That no ſuch incomparable tranſcendent excelleny, to cauſe ſo high a price to be put upon it, can be found in the work

it ſelf, may ſeem ſeveral waies to appear, if we conſider, 1. The time of compoſure, immediately upon the firſt dawning of the Goſpel light, and beginning of the knowledg of God in the midſt of us. 2. The perſons for whoſe uſe it was compoſed, ſuch that for the generality had ſcarce ſtept one foot out of Popiſh blindneſſe. 3. The end at which the compilers aimed, to frame ſuch a piece that might draw on a people wholly held in Maſſe Idolatry, to be content to accept ſomewhat in their own tongue, where prayers are directed to God in Chriſt, and not (as before they had been trayned) to Saints, and Angells; So that they made not that uſe of their own gifts for ſuch a work, as by the light received from God they might have framed, but ſuch a one that they judged moſt meet for the Churches preſent infant condition, and ſo contented themſelves, in a great part, with that which they found in the *Breviaries*, and *Portuiſes* of *Rome*. In ſo much that B. *Davenant* one of the graveſt and moſt learned of Prelates, ſaith, Deter. 37. [k] that *ſome of the Biſhops of Rome have offered to approve our form of prayers, provided that we would accept it by their authority*. This is ſufficient, if no more ſhould be ſaid, to make it appear that it did never come up to that excellency, that one might reach, that were compoſed in greater light, and for their uſe that were of further growth. But letting it paſſe without exception, and yielding (as muſt be granted) that thouſands are in heaven that received the Sacraments no otherwiſe then according to the directory in it, yet doubtleſſe, as muſt alſo be granted, that many more thouſands are in heaven, that never knew it, Chriſt and his Apoſtles never uſed it. It was not in uſe in the primitive times; How many *Liturgies* may be read, as we may ſee if we go no further then *Caſſander*? and this of ours is none of them. None of the reformed Churches in the world except *England* hath made uſe of it. Had it been of ſuch a glory that men would deny themſelves the benefit of the Sacrament, rather then want it, all ſhould at the greateſt coſt have procured it. As our forefathers in *England* ſent over into *Germany* for Bibles, at leaſt New Teſtaments with hazard of their lives, ſo ſhould they out of *Germany* have ſent for our *Liturgy*. Whereas ſome ignorantly ſay, that that was the Proteſtant Religion, *Proteſtaniſme* lives and dies with it; This is damnably injurious to all Proteſtants in all the world, but our ſelves; The want of this *Liturgy* ſtrikes them out of our Communion; It on the

[k] Quidam ex ipſis Pontificibus Romanis, formulam illam ſacrorum officiorum qua nos utimur, probare voluerit, modo nos ab ejus autoritate hac in re pendere voluiſſemus.

the other hand as much gratifies the Church of *Rome*, whoſe emiſſaries whiſper this into ignorant eares; they uſe to charge us, that *Henry* the eighth brought in our Religion, but according to theſe we are not ſo old, *Edward* the ſixth muſt be the father of it. It is not then from the excellency of the work that men can warrantably refuſe this ordinance of God; upon the want of it the Sacrament may ſtand in its glory without it. But it is from the ſanction that is put upon it, the law that hath eſtabliſhed it, to which the people of *England*, though not others, muſt be ſubject. This many learned in the lawes much queſtioned; while it was moſt in uſe with us upon grounds not eaſily anſwered; the act that impoſed it under ſo ſtrict penalties, referres to the book authorized by Parliament in the fifth, and ſixth years of *Edward* the ſixth, with two onely alterations; now the alterations from that time have been many more, and therefore the book is not the ſame. And whereas we ſhould have recourſe to the ſtandard, the original draught among Parliament-records, that for many yeares hath not been found. 2. When we have ſuffered ſo great a change, as we ſee in our lawes, divine providence ſo ordering, and yet keep ſilence, and in ſubmiſſion to divine will, conform to that which is in preſent; How is it that this ſhould be as the lawes of the *Medes* and *Perſians*, which changeth not? When it is taken from us, we muſt not leave an ordinance of God, to keep hold of it.

Variation from a geſture or poſture may not excuſe.

Others would receive it, in caſe they might keep up their wonted geſture when they come to it. But ſeeing that that in many places is not born, therefore they keep from it. *Anſw.* When ſome heretofore did forbear the Sacrament upon the account of kneeling, being ſo prejudiced againſt it (as no Scripture-poſture) that they durſt not uſe it, what clamours and invectives were raiſed againſt them, that they left (as was wont to be objected) a neceſſary duty for that which was arbitrary and indifferent, and upon ſo ſmal an account made a breach of that unity, which ought to be among the people of God? Was it not an uſual language in reproach of theſe, to ſay that they would receive it lying along; if it were poſſible ſtanding on their heads, rather then want it? and when theſe made it their complaint, that they were accounted ſchiſmatique Puritans, and worſe then Idolators, for not kneeling at the Sacrament, Abridg. pag. 39. *Bradſh.* arg. 11. He that took moſt paines, and wrote moſt largely in defence of

kneeling

kneeling, answers, *As for the imputations of Puritanes and Schismatiques, so far forth as the same be cast upon you for refusing to kneel, it is because you refuse and oppose the Church in a matter indifferent. For to strive against a National Church, and break the peace of it unjustly (as to break it about such mutable gestures in Gods worship, as are truely indifferent both in nature and use, is to break them unjustly) was ever held for a Schismatical course.* *Paybody* of kneeling, part 3. pag. 226. That which was then so blame-worthy, that men upon it were scarce judged fit to live in the Nation, is it now so innocent, and praise-worthy? will this be a good plea at the day of judgement, to speak to God in this language? Thou hast commanded the celebration of thy Supper, enjoyning us to take, eat, and to drink of it. Thou didst annex a promise of the body and blood of Christ for the pardon of sin; now there is a gesture which I would take in, which thou commandest not; in case I may not have my will in the one, why shouldst thou have thy will in the other? Let thy great promise go, rather then I will take and eat it, in any other posture then that which I have used. When so many and great troubles were in the Church about this gesture, which are not yet forgotten, many pious men yielded to it, though they saw inconvenience in it (seeing they durst not make a schisme in the Church, or be at the losse of a Sacrament) but were farre from believing any necessity of it, or in it. The party that urged it had never more to say then the command of authority, to put an obediential, not an inherent necessity upon it, (as Dr. *Sanderson* distinguishes) and the indifferency of it in its own nature to warrant it; If a gesture (which some have judged sinful, and all have confest to be unnecessary) now be waved, none should be so much offended.

Others yet would break through all of this, to come to this ordinance, neither want of *Liturgy*, nor change of gesture should keep them back. But there is a further barre in their way, that which *Peter* requires of every man, to be *ready alwaies to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them*, 1 Pet. 3. 15. is now called for, in case they will communicate. Here is their grievance, and therefore they will absent themselves, and here is a double exception. 1. The thing it self. 2. The manner of proceeding. As to the thing it self; It is objected, that the Apostle saies, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of this bread, and drink of this Cup, &c.*

A call by Church-officers for an account of knowledg and profession of faith is no warranty for absence.

Every

Every man then is to be left to his own private examination, and not to ſubject himſelf to the examination of another. For anſwer to this grievance, I ſay,

Firſt, In caſe that this examination, or account taken, did ſhoulder out that of ſelf examination, the objection were then to purpoſe; if theſe can be proved oppoſite, and not ſubordinate, one of them muſt then be waved.

Secondly, Let us then agree in this, that ſelf examination is neceſſary: and that it is to be done in order to the worthy receiving the Lords Supper; and all that would communicate, to be ready to engage themſelves for this ſelf-examination, and then I ſhall onely demand theſe queſtions.

Firſt, Whether they will examine themſelves, or engage for examination, that cannot examine? Whether they will make a ſearch, that have not eies to ſee? Whether they will prove themſelves, whether they be in the faith, that know not faith? Whether they will examine their humiliation under ſin, and return from ſin, that know not ſin? If a Miniſter of Chriſt ſhould call upon his people to examine, before they eat of this bread, or drink of this cup, he muſt upon that account take care that they be ſo farre knowing as to do it. If he muſt adminiſter it for edification, he ſhould ſee (ſo farre as he is able to diſcern) whether they be in a capacity to be edified by it. If this knowledg be wanting, then by their own confeſſion they are unmeet, in caſe they be of knowledg, it is eaſily ſignified, and made known, eſpecially fundamental neceſſary principles being alone demanded.

Secondly, Among other graces, wilt not thou in this ſelf-examination look for that grace of humility? that of hungring after Chriſt Jeſus evidenced in the love of his Ordinances? If thou art wholly wanting in the grace of humility, thou ſtandeſt unfit for this Table, *God reſiſts the proud, The ſoul that is liſt up is not right.* If once this be obtained, then thou wilt, as to thy guidance in heaven-way, not be too high to obey thoſe that are over thee in the Lord. Thoſe ſpeeches that we have heard of ſcorn, and compariſons entred, never came from an humble heart. If thou wanteſt an hungring fervent affection after Chriſt Jeſus, thou then art not meet for this Table, as being without a ſpiritual appetite; If thou haſt attained to it, no ſuch barres

barres will be pleaded, or ſpoken of to hold thee from it. Hunger will break ſtone-walls, iron-bars: This is a hard weapon that will break through all obſtacles.

The aſſociation of Elders in the work, no warranty for abſence.

For the manner, ſome ſay, If this were done by the Miniſter alone, they could eaſily bear, but others aſſociated they do not like. Ruling Lay-Elders they ſuppoſe are not of Gods inſtitution. To this I ſay,

First, What do they ſay to all the Reformed Churches almoſt in the World, that have that way of Diſcipline; if thou wert a member of the Church there, wouldeſt thou upon this account ſeparate and leave Church-Communion?

Secondly, What ſayeſt thou of our Government in this Church, when Biſhops were in power; who acted then in Government but *Chancellors*, and *Officials*, who were for the moſt part lay-perſons? If ſuch could rule over a whole County, perhaps three or four Counties; three or four may then with the Miniſter have inſpection into one Pariſh. The 26 Canon required Miniſters to keep back notorious offenders from the Sacrament; and Canon 27. provided that he ſhould give his reaſon upon complaint to the *Ordinary*, and obey his direction. This *Ordinary* was for the moſt part a Lay-perſon, and he was ſet over both the Miniſters and Communicants of many Congregations.

Thirdly, In caſe any judge that according to Goſpel-order, no others ſhould joyn with the Miniſter, but that he ſhould act alone in admiſſion; what prejudice is this to the Sacrament, when he that is confeſſedly called to the work, acts alone in the adminiſtration of it? And in caſe a Miniſter ſee it expedient to crave aſſiſtance in ſo weighty a buſineſſe, eſpecially where he is caſt upon a large Congregation, for his further information, and advice; where then is the evill? When Miniſters this way go alone, then it is auricular confeſſion, ſhrift, and whatſoever prophaneneſſe can deviſe; then partiality is objected, that out of ſpleen they put men from this Ordinance; when to avoid theſe even by conſent help is choſen, that on the other hand it is ſuch a grievance, that it is thought a ſufficient reaſon of mens abſence.

The mixture of ſuch that are ſuppoſed unworthy, no warranty for abſence.

Theſe that we have hitherto ſeen are extreams on the one hand. There are thoſe of an oppoſite party, that have their Objections likewiſe, and would come, as they ſay, to this Table,

in caſe they could meet with ſuitable gueſts there, and thoſe onely that become ſuch a Feaſt; ſuch that are holy, and no other; but looking for others there whom God never called, they reſolve upon that account to keep abſent. I anſwer, 1. Let theſe take heed leſt they take too much upon them, in paſſing ſentence upon all that come to joyn in this duty, and think better upon it, whether that, or ſomewhat elſe, ought not to be there their buſineſſe? 2. Whether they go not higher then the Word of God will bear them out in the principles that they lay for the qualification of ſuch a one that is admittible to this Supper? and take heed that their great ambition be not to find out a Church in that purity and glory, that Chriſt hath altogether denyed to be enjoyed on earth. 3. Where it is that they can have hopes to go to joyn, where all give evidences of regeneration, and no other are received? Theſe betake themſelves all their dayes to the Society of Seekers. As thoſe under the famine of the Word threatened by the Prophet, ſhall *wander from Sea to Sea, and from the North, even to the Eaſt, and ſhall run to and fro, ſeeking the Word of the Lord*: So may theſe, ſeeking a Church of their own fancying, but ſhall find none. But for more full ſatisfaction, let theſe take theſe following Arguments into conſideration.

Arguments evincing the lawfulneſſe of communicating in mixt Congregations.

Firſt, There is never an approved example in all the Scripture, of any one man that did ſeparate, or withdraw himſelf from an Ordinance, which God hath enjoyned upon the account of the impurity or defilement, either of him that did adminiſter, or of thoſe that were to joyn in it. It is true that it is ſaid, 1 *Sam.*2. 17. as the aggravation of the ſin of *Hophni* and *Phinehas* the ſons of *Eli*, that men then (and as appears for their ſakes) abhorred the offering of the Lord, and therefore in all probability abſented themſelves from it; but *Elkanah* and *Hannah* did not ſo, as appears, Chap. 1. 3, 7. and Mr. *Hilderſam*, Lect. 29 on *John*, pag. 129. obſerves from Chap. 2. 24. that it was their ſin that made any ſuch ſeparation.

Secondly, There are many approved Examples of the people of God to the contrary; how much do we read in the Prophets of the peoples wickedneſſe, and corruptions in the State Civill, and Eccleſiaſtical? yet which of them for that cauſe did make ſeparation? We ſee what company did reſort to the houſe of God in *Jeremy*'s time. *Jer.* 7. 9, 10. and yet we ſee *Jeremy* ready,

dy, when he had liberty, to reſort to it, *Jer.* 36. 5. Much was out of frame, and little in due order in Chriſts time; yet as he acknowledged, that even then *ſalvation was of the Jewes*, Joh. 4. 22. they had then ſaving Ordinances among them, ſo he held Communion with them, as he religiouſly obſerved other Feaſts, ſo ſome have obſerved (as we have heard) that he kept four Paſſeovers, after he appeared in publick, for the work of mans Redemption.

Thirdly, One mans ſin muſt not keep another from a neceſſary enjoyned duty; if one man will make himſelf by his prophane addreſſes guilty of Chriſts death, another muſt not therefore forbear to ſhew forth his death. This is ſuch a duty, and the ſin of another will by no means excuſe neglect of it: this were to ſin, becauſe another ſins; to deſpiſe an Ordinance, becauſe another prophanes it: when one came without a wedding garment, no invited gueſt for his ſake did keep from the wedding.

Fourthly, No one Communicant is bound to examine what all are, that are his fellow-Communicants; there is neither expreſſe command for it, nor yet reaſon to evince it; each man is bound to ſee himſelf arrayed, as he ought, and not to find fault in others addreſſes, *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat*; though he be to admoniſh as his brothers viſible ſin gives him occaſion.

Fifthly, The penalty of him that comes unworthily, reaches his own ſelf, that comes in his unworthineſſe, and extends no further. Legal uncleanneſſe defiled the man, that was perſonally unclean, and not his neighbour: ſo it is here, *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himſelf*, &c.

Sixthly, If one mans ſin this way do defile another, the ſin of one Communicant doth defile all other Communicants; then it muſt be either from the nature of ſin, thus to defile all in ſo near Communion, or from the nature of the Ordinance thus to be defiled to all, when one in defilement comes to it; or from ſome poſitive precept forbidding all to come, when any that is unclean is there. I doubt not but this is a ſufficient enumeration. But, 1. It is not of the nature of ſin, thus to defile all, in ſuch communion, then it would every where thus defile, whereſoever any have ſociety, or do accompany together. Then the

chief Prieſts had done well, to keep out of the Judgment-Hall, that they might be clean, to keep the Paſſeover, *John* 18. 28. and the Phariſees to waſh, when they came from Market. 2. It is not of the nature of the Ordinance to be thus defiled to all. It is not ſo in other Ordinances: *Cain*'s offering defiled not *Abels*, nor did *Hophni* and *Phinehas* in their offerings defile *Elkanah* and *Hannah* when they offered. 3. Nor yet is there any poſitive precept, forbidding a cleanſed ſoul, upon the account of the uncleanneſſe of another, to come to this Table.

Seventhly, If one mans preſence in this way defile another, then it is either his ſimple preſence, ſuch a ones being there in his infection, or elſe a willing and witting preſence with ſuch a one. If ſimple preſence do defile, then there is no man that can be ſecure. The cloſeſt hypocrite that creeps in unawares would be the undoing of all; when Chriſt ſaid, *Ye are clean, but not all*, Joh 13. 10. according to this opinion it had been a contradiction, the uncleanneſſe of one had been the defilement of all. Neither is it willing, or witting preſence, that can in this way defile, then it muſt be in every ſingle mans power to determine him to be ſuch, and exclude him thence, or elſe of neceſſity exclude himſelf. When the Elderſhip hath judged and received according to the general way of Reformed Churches, or the plurality of votes of believers, as it is with men of the Congregational way, he muſt make an after-ſearch, a further ſcrutiny; he that one judges fit, that moſt judge fit, ſome will judge unworthy, and upon that account muſt ſhut themſelves out of Communion. Men of ſuch principles muſt everlaſtingly avoid all Church-fellowſhip, or act againſt their principles; and we need not to ſpeak it, it is too plainly viſible what manner of perſons men of ſuch high pretences have in their Congregations. There are multitudes of Arguments heaped to nouriſh this ſcruple, but I ſhall not further trouble the Reader; there is nothing, I think, can be ſaid, but that which here hath been ſpoke, will afford a ſufficient anſwer.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

The being of Sacraments depends upon their use.

Another Position yet followes from the words,

The being of Sacraments depends upon their use, they are no Sacraments to those that do not partake of them.

The being of Sacraments consists in their use.

This is grounded upon this act of *Abraham* appointed of God, and accordingly done by him; *He received the sign of Circumcision.* All that he did was in obedience of the Divine Commandment, *Gen.* 17. 11. *And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a token of the Covenant betwixt me and you.* It was not the foreskin, but the foreskin cut off, that was the token of the Covenant. So also in that of the Passe-over, *Israel* had a command from God, *to take every man a lamb, and to eat the flesh rost with fire, and unleavened bread, and with bitter herbs ye shall eat it*, Exod. 12. 3, 8. It is not barely the Lamb, but eaten in the way that God prescribed, that made the Sacrament. In Baptisme, the command is, *Baptize them in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* It is not water that makes up Baptisme, but water applyed to the subject, or the subject to the water. In the Lords Supper there is bread and wine in their significancy held out, not for bare sight, but a Command is added; *Take, eat, drink ye all of this*; bread and wine makes not up the Sacrament, without breaking, giving, taking, and eating. In those Sacraments extraordinary. The Sea was no Sacrament, but *Israels* passage through it. The Cloud was no Sacrament, but *Israels* guidance by it, or the cloud guiding *Israel*, and *Israel* following after it. Neither was the Manna a Sacrament, or the rock considered in themselves; but the Manna eaten, the water of the rock drunk by the *Israelites*. Even the fictitious Sacraments of the Church of *Rome* consist in their use: Their *Order* is no Sacrament, where there is none Ordained; and *Marriage* is no Sacrament, where none are married. Their *Chrisme* in confirmation, *oyl* in extream unction not applyed, are of no use, or efficacy. This is plain in Reason.

Arguments to vince it.

First, The being of Sacraments depends on their institution; Take

Take away their inſtitution, and they have no being at all. But the inſtitution leads us not barely to an element, but preſcribes the uſe; not onely to a ſign, but the application of it; not onely to water, but to be baptized with water; not onely to bread and wine, but the eating of bread, drinking of wine, and the beholding of both.

Secondly, the being of Sacraments depends upon the relation of the ſign to the thing ſignified, with the analogy and proportion that is held between them. This is plain; Take away ſuch relation, and the element is a common element, and not a Sacrament; ſet aſide the conſideration of the blood, and Spirit of Chriſt, and water is an element for common uſe, to take away the filth of the fleſh, but for removal neither of the guilt, nor filth of ſin. Take away the conſideration of the body and blood of Chriſt, and bread may ſtrengthen nature, but not nouriſh the ſoul. But the relation is not barely in the ſigns, or elements, but in their applications to the ſubject; water beares no relation to the cleanſing of ſin, but waſhing with water; and bread and wine, no relation to the ſetting forth of the Lords death, remembrance of him, or life by him, but the breaking, eating, and drinking.

Thirdly, That which being removed nulls a Sacrament, that is neceſſary to the being of Sacraments. This is plain; Nothing can deſtroy being, but the want of that which is neceſſary to being: But the removal, or taking away of the uſe nulls and deſtroyes the being of Sacraments. Let not the foreskin be cut off, nor the Lamb roſted, and eaten; the water not be applyed to the perſon, nor bread and wine eaten and drunken, there is no Sacrament; therefore the uſe of Sacraments gives being to them.

Fourthly, All benefit of, and in the thing ſignified, conſiſts in the application, therefore the Sacraments for their being, uſe, and benefit, conſiſt in their application likewiſe. The conſequence is grounded upon the analogy that is between the ſign and the thing ſignified. The antecedent is clear, the blood of Chriſt, the ſufferings of Chriſt not brought home to the ſoul, and intereſt obtained by application, doth not benefit, or profit.

Fifthly, That which enters the definition of a Sacrament, is of the being of it. This none can deny: But the uſe or office of a Sacra-

Sacrament enters the definition of it: *Ergo.* The Apostle defines it to be a sign and seal, which plainly speaks not the nature, but the use of Sacramental elements.

Here is no Controversie in this thing among parties, save with the Church of *Rome*; neither is there any with them, save in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. They confesse that the being of Baptisme doth so consist in the use, that without it, it is no Sacrament. Onely the Lords Supper (for Transubstantiations sake) though never used, is still a Sacrament, when they reserve it in a box, carry it about for pomp, hold it up for worship, it is still a Sacrament. The body of Christ is still there, and if a mouse falls upon it, the mouse receives a Sacrament, knawes upon Christs flesh. But when worms breed in it (as they may by their own confession) they are hard put to it. They cannot breed upon accidents, the shape, the colour of bread cannot give being to worms. And to say that the substance which remains there, which is the flesh of Christ, breeds them, is no low blasphemy. The generation of one is the corruption of another, and God *will not suffer his holy One to see corruption.* I remember an answer to this great difficulty, (when I first read Philosophy) out of *Conimbricenses* Physicks; That learned Society did determine, that God by miracle did create matter, and laid it by the consecrate host, and that did putrifie, and not the consecrated bread, and so Worms were generated. They sure believe that it is an easie thing to put God upon miracles. Against this permanency of this Sacrament out of the use of it, we say,

The Sacrament of the Lords Supper equally transient with Baptisme.

First, If the use of this be instituted, as well as the use of Baptisme, and given in command; then this Sacrament consists in the use, as well as Baptisme. This cannot be denyed, for the institution, and Command of Christ must equally lead us in both. But in the Lords Supper, as well as in Baptisme, the use is within the institution, and given in Command by Christ; Therefore this Sacrament of the Lords Supper consists in the use, as well as that of Baptisme. Whereas *Bellarmine* replyes to this, that Christ commanded the bread to be eaten, but not presently after consecration; therefore to delay eating is not against the institution. To this we answer, 1. Neither did he command water, as soon as set apart for Baptisme, to be applyed to the party to be baptized; yet till it be applyed, the party is not baptized, wa-

ter

ter is no Sacrament; and ſo the bread and wine in that interim ſtill applyed, ſtill wants the nature of a Sacrament. 2. He did command it then to be eaten, by *Bellarmin*'s confeſſion, though not inſtantly to be eaten; and he gave the like command of the cup, as of the bread, yea, with more exactneſſe a note of univerſality added, *Drink ye all of it*; yet their Laity have a Sacrament, and never drink of it. 3. That which the Apoſtles did, that Chriſt enjoyned (as *Ameſius* well replyes;) they underſtood Chriſts intimation, as well as the moſt nimble-headed Jeſuites, but they did not reſerve it, but did eat it.

Secondly, If there be no footſteps in all the holy Scriptures, of any other way of dealing with the elements of the Lords Supper, then the eating and drinking of them; then, according to the inſtitution, they muſt be eaten, and drunken: But there is no footſtep there, of any other dealing with the Sacrament, then eating and drinking; Therefore according to the inſtitution it is not to be reſerved, but to be eaten and dtunk. Indeed *Chamier* quotes *Croquet* replying, that ſome of the Ancient have ſaid, that *Judas* took one part of the Sacrament, and reſerved the other for ſcorn; but this may be well reckoned among others of like nature in their Legends. And I would adviſe all thoſe that believe it, if they be ambitious to be diſciples of *Judas*, to follow it.

Thirdly, The promiſe in this Sacrament is not to be divided from the precept, by any that will expect a bleſſing. But where the promiſe is, *This is my body, this is my blood in the New Teſtament*; in the inſtitution, There is a precept, *Take, eat, Drink ye all of this*; therefore they muſt eat, and drink, that will have benefit in the promiſe. It would little I ſuppoſe pleaſe the Reader to hear *Bellarmine*, *Suarez*, and other Jeſuits to exempt this Sacrament from the common nature of Sacraments, and to make it permanent, when the other (as they ſpeak) are tranſeunt. *Thomas Aquinas*, Part 3. Quæſt. 73. art. 1. reſp. ad. 3. makes this difference between the Euchariſt and other Sacraments, *This Sacrament is perfected* (ſaith he) *in the conſecration of the matter, other Sacraments are perfected in the application of the matter to the perſon to be ſanctified.* *Suarez*, diſp. 42. Sect. 4. quotes it with approbation; and *Scotus in quanto* Diſt. 8. quæſt. 1. as he is quoted by *Ameſius*, *All the Sacraments except the Euchariſt conſiſt in their uſe*; ſo that in them the Sacrament, and the receiving

ving of the Sacrament is the ſame. He that pleaſes may read *Bellar.* Arguments, lib. 4. *de Euchariſtia*, Cap. 2, 3, 4. *Suarez* in the place named with *Whitakers*, *Ameſius*, *Vorſtius* in 3. Tom. *Bellar.* Theſ. 9. pag. 406. *Chamier* againſt them both, with others of that party, *de Euchariſtia*, lib. 7. cap. 4, &c. I ſhall deſire to take up the Reader with that which I judge more neceſſary; *Gerard* in his Common places, Cap. 4. *de Sacramentis*, makes it his buſineſſe to find out the *Genus* in the definition of a Sacrament, in which the geheral form of Sacraments, he ſayes, is to be included; and concludes, 1. In the negative, that it is not to be defined a ſign, and in the affirmative, that it is an action. Though this perhaps might rather have been taken into conſideration when we ſpake of Sacramental ſignes, and laid open that part of the definition, yet being ſlipt there, it may not inconveniently be ſpoken to in this place. In this determination of his, he ſuppoſeth, he meeteth with a double error; One, of the Papiſts, but now examined, that the Euchariſt is a permanent thing, and not tranſient; which it cannot be, in caſe it be an action. And the other both of Papiſts, and the followers of *Calvin*, (as he calls them) both of which affirm, that it is a ſign, and that muſt ſupply the place of the *genus* in the definition; and though he profeſſes willingly to yeeld, that Sacraments may be called ſignes, in reſpect of their office, and end; yet he will not have it put into the definition, forgetting it ſeems (for he doth not once take notice of it) that the Apoſtle in the Text ſo defines it. His Reaſons to conclude, that Sacraments are not to be defined, as ſignes are:

1. [a] *A thing it ſelf is one, and the end, and office is another. The appellation of it by the office is one, and the definition by the eſſence is another: Now to be ſignes, and ſeales, is the end and office of Sacraments.* To which I anſwer; That Sacrament denoteth the office and uſe for which ſuch and ſuch an element, according to Divine appointment, ſerves.

[a] Aliud eſt res ipſa, aliud ejus officium ac finis, aliud appellatio ejus ex officio, aliud definitio ex eſſentia. Definitio eſt λόγος οὐσίας. Ergo genus in definitione peti debet ex rei definitæ eſſentiâ; jam vero eſſe ſignum non pertinet ad quidditatem, ſed ad ejus finem & uſum.

If we ſhould go about to define bread or water (which are appointed to be ſignes) to be ſignes and ſeales, we ſhould run upon a great errour. For it is neither of the eſſence of bread, nor wine to be a ſign. But defining a Sacrament in that way, we hold forth the very eſſence of it.

2. He saies [b] *The definition ought to consist of that which is before, and better known then the thing defined; But signes and seales are not before, and better known then Sacraments.* The minor which every one will be ready to deny, he proves, *Because the knowledg of them depends on actions and Ceremonies*, as though the Elements alone were signes without consideration of the actions which in the institution are enjoyned. His third reason is, because [c] *to be a signe is not the immediate, but the remote genus of a Sacrament*, which he proves in that *it is no signe otherwise then by reason of actions accompanying.* Where we meet with the same mistake as before. If it be by the help of actions that they are signes, it is then by help of themselves, Elements with their actions and not otherwise are signes. 4. He saies, [d] *One part of a thing is not the genus of it, as whole: But signs are but part of a Sacrament, There being two parts, one terrene, and the other heavenly; and therefore it is not the genus.* To which I reply, 1. The action which he puts into the definition is but one part sure, and the earthly part, whether it be the action of the dispenser, or receiver, that he understands by action. 2. It seems that he would have a definition of an outward Element, and Christ put into one notion together. 3. We define that which lies upon our hand by divine institution, which is the office of such, and such Elements with the actions about them, leading to the thing signified. Lastly, He saith [e] *that the genus in a definition must not be ambiguous: But this is ambiguous, for men speak of signes ambignously.* But this is nothing to those that speak distinctly of signes, when they put them into a definition, and make it to appear what signes they mean; So that the Apostles definition making Sacraments signes, is yet uncontroulable. And defence being made that they are rightly defined to be signes, all that is said to prove that action is to be the *genus*, may easily be answered.

1. The author by an induction proves, that *actions are enjoyned in all Sacraments*, which we easily yield, and as easily prove that those

[b] 2. Definitio debet constare ex prioribus & notioribus; Sacramenta esse signa & sigilla ex prioribus & notioribus, quia ipsorum cognitio pendet ex actionibus & ceremoniis, hæ enim cum fine, qui est signare, conjunctæ, dicuntur signa & sigilla.

[c] 3. Proprium genus debet esse propinquum; signum autem est genus Sacramenti remotum, tum quia à fine petita est hæc denominatio, tum quia mediantibus actionibus certo verbo & externo elemento constantibus significant.

[d] 4. Pars rei non est genus rei ut totius; signa in oculos incurrentia sunt pars Sacramentorum, una terrena scilicet, cui adjuncta res coelestis invisibilis Sacramentum proprie dictum constituit.

[e] 5. Genus non debet esse ambiguum; at quia vox signi est ambigua, &c.

those are significant actions, and so make up the sign, and that they are Sacramentall, not *quâ* actions, for then as often as we eat bread, or drink wine, we should be at a Sacrament; and as often as a woman puts water upon her childs face, she should be about baptisme.

2. *Sacraments* (saith he) *are actions; Circumcision is an action, so the Paschal Lamb, Baptisme, and the Lords Supper. The first is the cutting off the foreskin; the second is the rosting, and eating of a Lamb; the third is dipping or sprinkling with water; and the fourth eating and drinking bread and wine.* Answ. 1. And all these are significant actions in and about an outward element, and so we are where we were. 2. These instances are no proofes that Sacraments are actions, but that action is required to the making up of a Sacrament. It is not simply action, but an action with restraint to such an Element, in, and about such a subject; Circumcision in any other part could have been no Sacrament, nor yet eating of any other creature in the time of the law then a Lamb of the flock, or of the herd; nor yet any other eating and drinking of bread and wine, then in the manner prescribed. And so we may say of dipping, pouring, or sprinkling 3. He does not tell us, whether it be the dispensers action, or the receivers, that makes a Sacrament. In Circumcision, and Baptisme he speakes nothing of any action in the receiver. In the Passeover and Lords Supper he saies nothing of any action of the dispenser. And it is for the receivers sake that the Sacrament is appointed, and *Isaacs* Circumcision, and every infants Baptisme (if not *Abrahams* Circumcision, and Baptisme of men of years) may rather be defined by passion then action. And passion may as well challenge the seat of Sacraments, as action, where he placeth it. He concludes, *that ancient and modern Writers, yea, Calvins followers call them by the name of rites, and Ceremonies, which we know to consist in action.* Here is a manifest mistake, rites and Ceremonies are not alwaies actions, neither humane, nor divine Ceremonies. The high Priests Ephod, with the rest of those holy garments prescribed, were Ceremonies, and so was the surplice while in use in *England*, and yet these were in the predicament of *Habitus* and not of *Actio*. It is true that the putting them on was an action, but that was not the Ceremony, but the wearing of them in the work of worship, and the putting it on was no act of him that wore it, but his that waited

waited upon him. And kneeling at the Sacrament was esteemed a Ceremony with us, yet no action, but a gesture, or posture of the body, and in the predicament of *Situs*, Dr. *Burges* indeed in his rejoynder defines a Ceremony to be an action, pag. 29. But presently he explaines himself, and saies, *I call it an action, because nothing is or can be a Ceremony in respect of existence, or being, but onely in respect of acting or usage thereof, as a ceremony*: so that he takes action *abusive*, for any manner of usage whatsoever; upon the publishing of the book, I spake with the author of this thing, and he acknowledged action strictly taken, was too narrow to be the *Genus* of a Ceremony, and that it was holpen by the word usage. So Dr. *Sanderson*, that renouned Logician, speaking of the execution done by *Phinehas* in the division of his text, calls his standing up an action, but presently addes, *Though I call it an action; yet it is a gesture properly, and not an action*, so that when rites, and Ceremonies may be postures, or habits, it cannot be said that they consist in action; so that it is clear, that Sacraments consist in their use, and though actions be seen in every Sacrament, either done by the dispenser, or receiver, or both; yet those actions being upon, and about some visible element, and the Elements themselves, with the actions being allsignificant; Sacraments are yet rightly defined to be signes, and not actions.

There is no continued holinesse in Sacramental elements.

Then it must necessarily follow by way of Corollary, *that there is no holinesse remaining in the elements, no relative holinesse abiding upon them, further then according to the institution they are applyed and received.* The water in the vessel that containes it is no further (as I may say) consecrate then as it is applyed to the person baptized. The river of *Jordan*, nor yet the waters near *Ænon*, in *Salem*, had no more holinesse then other waters in *Jury*. The reliques of bread and wine in the Lords Supper, have no more of holinesse, when they are taken from thence then they had when they were brought thither. Tipling off of the wine in the place where it was immediately before received as a Sacrament (of which I have heard) is undecent, and unsuitable to the work that they have been upon, yet it is no other then common wine that then is taken. Care should be taken not to defile the person who remaines consecrate to God, and in participation of these elements makes profession of it, no such fear of prophaning the elements themselves. But for a great part

these are well contented to be prophane, provided that the elements may be esteemed, and honoured as holy. This high opinion of holinesse in the consecrated wine robbed the people of it. Many of the Laity have beards that may lick some drops of it up, and the number encreasing it must passe through so many hands, or be put to so many mouthes, that some may be spilt; and those fears here so wrought, that they may not meddle at all with it. And how great disputes there have been, what shall be done with it, if a weak stomack vomit it up while the *species* of it doth remain unchanged; they that are verst in Popish Casuists well know. And all this from that monster of Transubstantiation. But when a right use of the Sacraments is understood, all these superstitious conceits will vanish, and come to nothing; when a sealed indenture hath done its office, we no longer look much after the wax, and parchment.

Their touch or abode upon any thing or utensil does not make it holy.

Secondly, *If their Sacramental nature remain no longer then their use, so that themselves are no further holy, then their touch, or former abodes cannot make any place, or utensil holy; it cannot leave any such remaining holinesse* (as some conceit) *behind.* So it would follow that in case the words of consecration be pronounced over all the bread in the greatest pantry, or to be sold in the market place (which men of that opinion say may be done) then not onely every bit of that bread is turned into Christ, but all the binges or panniers that receive the bread in them must have an holinesse remaining, and abiding upon them, and so in like case all the Wine in the cellar, yea, all the earth of the Land of *Canaan* would remain holy by reason of the Manna falling upon it, which was spiritual meat, therefore a prophaning of it, to tread with the foot upon it, much more for beasts to dung and graze it. As much is said to prove that the rock was Christ, as there is to prove that the cup is Christs blood. If that had such a sanctifying power, then all the ground on which the water ran, yea, every beast that drank of it, was made holy. The thought of this might have silenced that talk of bowing to the place of Gods special residence, by which they meant the place where the Sacrament hath been celebrated, which of a Table they made an Altar, which then according to our Saviour Christ, must make holy the body and blood of Christ, offered upon it, and the body and blood of Christ must not make it holy, *Ye fooles, and blind, whether is greater, the gift or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?* Matth. 23.

23. 19. But with us the gift did put the ſanctification upon the Altar, that from the time that the gift had been upon it, men muſt upon ſight ſtill worſhip *ad, verſus, coram*, amazing thoſe that were offended at it, with their diſtinction of inheſive and abſtractive holineſſe.

CHAP. X. SECT. I.

Sacraments are ſeales.

HEre followes a ſecond uſe and office of Sacraments; which being added to the former, makes up the whole for which they ſerve. As they are ſignes, ſo they are ſeales; from whence a double Obſervation followes.

Sacraments are ſeales.

All that the Sacraments work on the ſoules of receivers is by way of ſign and ſeal.

First, *Sacraments are ſeales.*

Sacraments are ſeales.

Before this can be proved, by reaſon of the ambiguity of the word, it is to be diſtinguiſhed; *Seal* is ſometimes taken properly, and that is yet twofold: 1. A ſeal ſealing, or making an impreſſion, and ſo the inſtrument uſed for that purpoſe is called a ſeal, or ſignet; ſo, *Gen.* 38. 18. *Judah* delivered to *Tamar* his *ſignet*, or ſeal; ſo, *Dan.* 6. 17. 2. A ſeal ſealed, or receiving an impreſſion; ſo the Letters that we ſend have their ſeales upon them, when we yet keep our ſignet, or ſealing ſeal, to make thouſands of impreſſions: ſo in the viſion, *Revel.* 5. 1. there is a book with *ſeven ſeales*. Sometimes the word is uſed Metaphorically. And that is alſo twofold; 1. By way of alluſion to the ſignet, or inſtrument ſealing; and ſo thoſe things that are of great eſteem, and highly prized, are called by the name of ſeales, or ſignets, *Jerem.* 22. 24. *As I live, ſaith the Lord, Though Coniah the ſon of Jehojakim the King of Judah were the ſignet upon my right hand, yet would I pluck thee thence.* So, *Hag.* 2. 23. 2. By way of alluſion to the uſe and office of a ſignet, or ſeal, as making impreſſion on things ſealed, that is, as doing the office of ſuch ſeales: Here it is taken metaphorically, not in a proper

Several acceptations of the word.

ſenſe,

ſenſe, but in alluſion to the uſe of ſeales, not the ſignet it ſelf. Now the uſe of ſeales is various.

Several uſes of a ſeal.

For Secrecy.

First, For ſecrecy, to keep things cloſe, ſo that while the ſeal is upon them none may look into them. To that end we uſe to put ſeales on our Letters, that they may not be read by any but thoſe whom they concern; ſo the chief Prieſts ſealed the ſtone of Chriſts Sepulcher, *Matth.* 27. 66. To this uſe of a ſeal the Prophet alludes, *Iſai.* 8. 16. *Bind up the teſtimony, ſeal the Law among the diſciples*; and *John* alſo in that viſion, *Revel.* 5. 1. *I ſaw in the right hand of him that ſate on the Throne a book written within, and on the back ſide ſealed with ſeven ſeales.*

For Warranty.

Secondly, For warranty and authority in the diſcharge of any buſineſſe. *Haman* had *Ahaſuerus* his ſeal for the ſlaughter of the *Jewes*, Eſth. 3. 12. And *Jezabel* had the ſeal of *Ahab* to bring *Naboth* into queſtion, 1 *King.* 21. 8. and to this uſe of a ſeal the Lord Chriſt alludes, where he vouches the authority of the Son of man to give life to the world, *Him hath God the Father ſealed*, Joh. 6. 27.

For Diſtinction.

Thirdly, For diſtinction, or ſeparation, to mark out things that are to be known, and diſtinguiſhed from others. Commodities allowed to paſſe, have the publick Officers ſtamp; and the Merchant puts his mark on the wares that he buyes, as the Grazier on his beaſts, the Shepherd on his flock, to diſtinguiſh them from thoſe that belong to others. To this the Apoſtle alludes, 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. *Having this ſeal, The Lord knoweth them that are his.*

For Security.

Fourthly, For ſecurity, to keep things inviolable, and free from harm. To that end *Daniels* priſon-door was ſealed, *Dan.* 6. 17. To this uſe of ſeales *Solomon* alludes, *Cant.* 4. 12. *A garden incloſed is my ſiſter, my ſpouſe, a ſpring ſhut up, a fountain ſealed.* Water was precious in thoſe parts, therefore they ſhut up their Wells, and ſealed them, that none might draw out water from them. The like alluſion we ſee in that viſion, *Revel.* 7. 2, 3. *And I ſaw another Angel aſcending from the Eaſt, having the ſeal of the living God, and he cryed with a loud voice to the four Angels, to whom it was given, to hurt the earth, and the Sea, ſaying, Hurt not the earth, neither the Sea, nor the trees, till we have ſealed the ſervants of our God in the foreheads.*

For ratification.

Fifthly, For ratification, and confirmation; for further, and more firm aſſurance. In the grants and conveyances of men the

the ſeal is to make the title unqueſtionable, *Jer.* 32. 10. *I ſubſcribed the evidence, and ſealed it.* The *Corinthians* converſion to Chriſt, did evidence the Apoſtles Call to the work of an Apoſtle; and therefore he ſayes, *The ſeal of mine Apoſtleſhip are ye in the Lord,* 1 Cor. 9. 2. We find a ſeal, and earneſt given, *Epheſ.* 1. 13, 14. 2 *Cor.* 1. 22. to be one and the ſame; and the uſe of earneſts we know is for confirmation, to ratifie a Covenant, or bargain: what the Apoſtle ſaith of an oath for confirmation, that *among men it is for end of all ſtrife,* Heb. 6. 16. the ſame we may ſay of a ſeal, that puts an end to differences, and contentions. And what an oath is to a promiſe, a ſeal is likewiſe; and Gods oath added to his promiſe, is of the ſame uſe as his ſeal, *that by two immutable things in which it is impoſſible for God to lye, we ſhould have ſtrong conſolations,* Heb. 6. 18. yea, *Abraham* the leading man in Covenant had from God both oath and ſeal added for confirmation of his promiſe; The Apoſtle makes obſervation of his oath out of Scripture-hiſtory, *Heb.* 6. 13, 14. *When God made promiſe to Abraham, becauſe he could ſweare by no greater, he ſware by himſelf, ſaying, Surely bleſſing I will bleſſe thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee.* And here he makes like obſervation of his ſeal, God having entred Covenant with *Abraham,* and his ſeed, addes this for ratification, *Geneſ.* 17. 10. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee, Every manchild among you ſhall be circumciſed;* which the Apoſtle here interprets to be both a ſign, and a ſeal. *He received the ſign of Circumciſion, a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe,* &c. And in this reſpect Sacraments are called ſeales, to ratifie and confirm all that the Covenant doth hold out, and promiſe. That which doth the office of a ſeal, or earneſt between man and man, that is fitly called a ſeal between God and his people: But Sacraments do the ſame Offices between God and his people, as ſeales and earneſts do between man and man; ſeales and earneſts ratifie mans Covenant, Sacraments ratifie and confirm the Covenant of God; and therefore Sacraments are fitly called ſeales.

Objections againſt this office of Sacraments.

But exceptions are here taken by thoſe that do deny that Sacraments have any ſuch office as to be for ſeales.

Firſt, *This is the alone place where any Sacrament is called in Scripture by the name of ſeal; This Sacrament is onely once, and no other Sacrament any where ever ſo called: And there-*

fore

fore it will not hence follow that Sacraments are ſeals. *Sol.*

Anſw. 1 This will conclude them to be no ſignes, as well as it will conclude that they are no ſeales; Circumciſion is here called a ſign, and no other Sacrament is in any Scripture-Text called a ſign; yet all confeſſe that they are all ſigns. They may therefore notwithſtanding this objection be ſeales as well as ſignes. 2. The calling of it a ſeal, doth not make it one, but onely declare it to be ſuch: Before ever the Apoſtle had given it theſe names, it was both a ſign and ſeal, as well as after: other Sacraments are likewiſe ſeals, where there are like Sacramental expreſſions, notwithſtanding they have no ſuch name in Scripture. And as the Apoſtle infers from the inſtitution of Circumciſion, and *Abrahams* acceptation of it, that Circumciſion was a ſeal, ſo may we infer in like manner, that other Sacraments are ſigns and ſeals. Compare that which the Apoſtle here deduceth from *Gen.* 17. concerning *Abrahams* Circumciſion, with that which may be deduced from *Acts* 8. 34, 35. concerning the Eunuchs Baptiſme; *Abraham* believed, and was juſtified upon believing, and then received the ſign of Circumciſion, *a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, which he had being uncircumciſed.* And the Eunuch did believe on *Philips* preaching, and afterwards received Baptiſme. May we not well then ſay, He received the ſign of Baptiſme, a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe that he had being yet unbaptized? ſo we may ſay of *Pauls* Baptiſme, and the Jaylours, upon their miraculous converſion to the faith they received the ſign of Baptiſme for the ſame reaſon.

Secondly, *It is demanded, whether the Covenant of grace, and promiſes of ſalvation be compleat, valid, and firm in themſelves, without theſe things annexed to them? or whether they be meerly void, and null in Law, as Kings, and mens Deeds, and Charters, without a ſeal to confirm them? If incompleat, infirm, and invalid, this is extreamly derogatory to the Covenant, and therefore they are not properly ſeals.* *Object.*

Anſw. 1. If there be ſome diſſimilitude between civill ſeals uſed by men in Charters, and conveyances, and ſeals of God put to his Covenant, will it then follow that upon that account they are no ſeals? There are diſſimilitudes between the Ambaſſadors of Princes, and the Miniſters of Chriſt reſpective to their functions, are Miniſters then no Ambaſſadors? There is difference between ſervants of men, and ſervants of God, are Chriſtians then *Sol.*

no ſervants? Sacraments are ſeals by way of metaphor, becauſe they do the office that ſeals do among men, and if they do not *per omnia quadrare*, as no metaphors do, yet in caſe they agree in the main for which that ſerves from whence the metaphor is borrowed, it is ſufficient. Miniſters are fitly called Ambaſſadors; being ſent of God to treat from him with a people, as Ambaſſadors are ſent of Princes, notwithſtanding that thoſe to whom Ambaſſadours come, may treat, or not treat at pleaſure; may give in Propoſitions, as well as receive them; when they to whom Gods Miniſters are ſent, muſt give audience, muſt take the Propoſitions delivered, and not ſtand to Capitulate. If Sacraments ratifie to us the promiſes of the Covenant; That is enough to denominate them ſeales, though wit could deviſe twenty differences. And yet I read ſome differences aſſigned, which (I confeſſe) I do not underſtand to be any differences at all. 2. I know not that it is abſolutely true in Law, that mens grants are void altogether, without a ſeal; I have heard of Leaſes parol, and Wills nuncupative, which I am ſure have no ſeal. And ſeales ſometimes by the injury of time are utterly broke, and loſt; and in this caſe I ſuppoſe the Covenant may yet ſtand. 3. What is objected againſt this office of Sacraments, as ſeales, may alſo be objected againſt the oath of God made to *Abraham* for confirmation of his Word. That will admit the ſame *dilemma*; Either his Word of Promiſe was true, and firm without it, or elſe (which I am loath to ſpeak) ſubject to change. The application is eaſie. The ſame thing was revealed to *Pharaoh* in a dream for ſeven years plenty, and ſeven years famine, by a double ſign; If there was truth in one, we may argue the ſecond needs not; if untrue, neither have cauſe to be heeded, or regarded. If we will undertake ſuch kind of reaſonings, we ſhould make no end. 4. The Covenant is compleat, full, firm, and valid, in caſe we ſhould never more then once hear it, or never have any ſeal put to it, nor any oath for confirmation; yet our unbelief, and diſtruſt is ſuch, that we need ingeminations, inculcations, oaths, ſeals, and all from God to uphold us.

Object. Thirdly, *It is yet demanded, whether theſe ſeales are inſeparably annexed to the Covenant, and promiſes of grace in the Old, or New Teſtament, as parts, or parcels of them, as ſeales are annexed to the Charter? If yea, then ſhew us to what Covenants, and Promiſes, and in, and by what Texts they are thus inſeparably annexed.*

nexed, and how any can be saved or made partakers of the benefit of the Covenant, and promises of grace, who do not actually receive these seales of grace? when as your selves with all Orthodox Divines must grant, that many who were never baptized, and infinite who never received the Lords Supper, are and may be saved, and are made partakers of the Covenant, and promises of grace, without receiving, or enjoying these seales of grace. If no, then how can these be termed seales of the Covenant, and promises of grace, which are not inseparably affixed to them, as seales are to Charters? since many receive the Covenant, and promises of grace, without these seales; and other receive these seales, without the Covenant, or promises, the benefit whereof they never enjoy.

Answ. They are inseparably joyned *respectu præcepti*, as being enjoyned of God (and here all the Texts brought to prove the Sacraments not arbitrary, but necessary; may be brought in to witnesse) though not so *respectu medii*, The Covenant may have its effect without them, The Covenant is intire in it self without them. They are not inseparable *quoad esse*, yet they have their necessity (though not simple, and absolute) *quoad operari*, for the Covenant to have its due work on our hearts. God saw them necessary, helpful, and useful, and therefore gave them in charge, as many Scriptures witnesse, and we of necessity must submit to them, in order to obtain the end to which they serve; and for which they are designed, and appointed. *Sol.*

SECT. II.

Rules for a right understanding of Sacramental Seales.

Explicatory Propositions touching the sealing of Sacraments.

First, These are outward, visible seales; and priviledges of visible Churches, and Church-membership, committed to the Stewards of God in his house to dispense, and apply to their people. And so different from that other seal of God frequently mentioned, the seal of the Spirit, which is internal, invisible, proper onely to the elect, regenerate, reserved in the

hand of God, according to prerogative to give. That these are external, and visible, needs no more then our eyes; and that they are the priviledg of visible Churches, and Church-members, sufficient hath been spoken. And therefore they both agree in the general nature of a seal, both are for ratification, and confirmation of the truth of Gods promises, yet in a different way, and different latitude; They have the former, that never reacht the latter; and the former is serviceable to attain to the latter.

Secondly, They are seales not to confirm any truth of God in it self, or to work in us any assent to general Scripture-Propositions, But as general truths are brought home by particular application, so they seal mens particular interest in the Covenant. *He that hath the Son hath life; He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.* These are Scripture-Propositions, and he that is to seek here hath no cure in the Sacraments; They can give no direct remedy. These signs and seals take this for granted, and cannot make proof of it. But when this is assented to in the general, *He that hath the Son, hath life*; and he that feeds upon him, shall live for ever; Here soules are confirmed in their particular interests, that the Son is theirs, and that they feed upon him for life eternal.

Thirdly, we must distinguish the outward sign in the Sacrament together with that which is done about them, or any of them, and the Communicants act in the bare beholding of them, from our act of receiving of them. In the former sense they are no more then signes. The Lords Supper thus considered is no more then a remembrance, memorial, or representation of Christs death and passion. In the latter it is a seal, pledge or earnest. And therefore to say that Christ ordained it to be a remembrance, memorial, and representation of his death is a truth. But to say that therefore he did not ordain it to be a seal, is a manifest error. If Christ had taken bread, and broken it; taken the cup, and poured out wine, and had said, This is my body, this is my blood, here had been a sign, a memorial, a representation, and no more: But when he saies, *Take, eat, this is my body; This is my blood in the New Testament, drink ye all of this*; it is, as Circumcision was, both a sign and seal: As a sign, remembrance or representation; the beholding is sufficient, as the *Israelites* did the brazen Serpent, and as Papists look on their Images, for which if they had an institution,

tion, as they have a prohibition, they might be defended; and if we were to do no more, it would be no more then a sign, memorial, and representation; But being to receive it, It is a seal, and pledge of that which it represents, and brings to our minds.

Fourthly, They are not absolute seals, but conditional; They do not make it good to all, that Christ is theirs; but upon Gods terms, which is expresst by St. *Peter* to be the answer of a good conscience towards God; Of this I spake largely, Treatise of the Covenant, pag. 34, 35, &c. which by Mr. *Baxter* in his Apology hath been examined, Sect. 60, to Sect. 82. which here must briefly be taken into consideration.

A digression for vindication of chap. 7. *of the Treatise of the Covenant, from Mr.* Baxters *exceptions, touching conditional sealing in Sacraments.*

HAving in my Treatise of the Covenant, shewed at large that the Covenant of grace is conditional, In my seventh Chapter I inferr'd, that the seals of the Covenant are as the Covenant it self conditional; making it good with six several arguments, as I had before asserted it in my answer of Mr. *T.* chap. 15. p. 100. This reverend Mr. *Baxter* is pleased to take notice of in his Apology; and to put the question in opposition to me in these words, Sect. 60. *Whether the Sacraments seal the conditional promise absolutely; or the conclusion conditionally; when onely one of the premises is of Divine revelation: and whether this conclusion be* de fide, *I am justified, and shall be saved?* Which terms I leave to the intelligent Reader to consider. He is not pleased to take notice of any one of my arguments whether it is because he judges them unworthy of his answer, or for any other reason, I cannot tell. I produce likewise the testimony of many of our Divines, speaking the same thing, and he takes as little notice of any of their authorities. As I then spake what reason inforced me to believe, so I have the same reason still, to believe what I have spoke; and when all is examined,

which

which may be found in that apology, from p. 115, to p. 144. I think more is ſpoken for me then againſt me. He is pleaſed, pag. 139. to ſay, *The difference is ſo ſmall, that were it not for ſome ſcattered by-paſſages, I would ſcarce have replyed to you.* I therefore ſhall return no other rejoynder, but onely to obſerve ſuch paſſages as may beſt ſerve to clear the truth in queſtion; He goes about to take away the ſubject of the queſtion, and ſaies, *I never heard of, nor knew a conditional ſealing in the world*; which to me is very ſtrange. Beſides what I have ſpoken of it, he hath doubtleſſe read Mr. *Marſhalls* anſwer to Mr. *T.* (and, pag. 224. of his Treatiſe of Infant-Baptiſme, he makes us know that he hath read it,) and he expreſly calls it, *a conditional ſeal of the receivers intereſt in the Covenant.* He confeſſes the poſſibility, but aſſerts the vanity of ſuch ſealing. *As if a man* (ſaith he) Sect. 77. pag. 140. *ſhould ſet the wax and material Seal to a deed of gift, with this addition, I hereby ſeal to this, or own it as my deed; if ſuch a man be now living in* France, *or if ſuch a ſhip be ſafe arrived, or if ſuch a man ſhall do ſuch a thing, otherwiſe this ſhall be no ſeal.* Here I think an impoſſibility is found out; Is an actual Seal made no Seal upon any condition in the World? Hath he never heard of that Maxime, *Quicquid eſt, quando eſt, neceſſe eſt eſſe*: or that other, *Quod factum eſt, infectum reddi nequit?* And we are wont to ſay, that this is not within an omnipotence to make a thing that is, whileſt it is, not to be: unleſſe Mr. *Baxter* means that ſuch wax with impreſſion made, is formally no ſeal, before the time that in law it hath its efficacy, as he ſeems to ſay, Sect. 72. where he hath theſe words, *To ſay, I conditionally ſeal, is to ſay, It ſhall be no ſeal, till the performance of the condition.* So a bond ſealed and delivered in preſence of witneſſes, is unſealed till it be forfeited; which is a manifeſt abſurdity. And I ſpeak not of a conditional ſeal as oppoſed to actual, I ſhould call ſuch a ſeal not conditional, but potential; I ſpeak to conditional ſealing, as it is in the queſtion, that is, when a man ties himſelf by ſeal to ſuch or ſuch a thing, not abſolutely, but upon condition; and ſuch ſealings I think are common in the world. A Maſter ſeals to his Apprentice, and binds himſelf at the end of his term, to apparel him, to make him free of his myſtery, &c. but all this upon terms and condition of true and faithful ſervice. If *Philemon* in his way had ſealed to *Onſimus*, his ſeal had not tyed him to make good ſuch engage-

ments.

ments. I have alwaies thought, As is the obligation, ſo is the ſeal; and if there be no ſuch conditional obligations, we have been long abuſed with ſuch forms: *The condition of this obligation is ſuch, &c.* But if any liſt to ſay, that Sacraments abſolutely ſeal upon conditions as it ſeems Mr. *Baxter* chooſes to ſpeak, and ſome of his friends have ſaid is more proper, (though I do not ſee it, yet) I will not contend about it. He tells me that he confeſſes, that *neither promiſe nor ſeal bind abſolutely, till the condition be performed*, pag. 140. and this is the whole that I deſire; I am there taken up for ſaying, [That the conditional promiſe is not any abſolute undoubted truth, but upon ſuppoſal of the condition put.] If the Reader compare the context either in the precedent or ſubſequent words, he may eaſily ſee [*truth*] there ſhould have been [*tye*]; and I think he could ſcarce have miſſed the ſight of it, had my ſentence been fully quoted. The cloſe of my ſpeech in theſe words [ſo both promiſe and ſeal abſolutely bind] is left out; yet the words as they ſtand, though they carry no congruity, might have received a fair Interpreration. It was no abſolute truth that the Jaylour ſhould be ſaved, but upon condition of his believing. I ſhall not trouble the Reader with that, which to him would be tedious, and from which he can receive ſlender benefit; I ſhall onely take notice of ſome paſſages which Mr. *Baxter* is pleaſed to put into his Index, ſeeing many will perhaps look there, that will go no further. *The Minor being ſealed, the Concluſion is not* eo nomine *ſealed, as Mr.* Bl. *affirmeth*, and refers to Sect.65. p.123. but his charge is, p.124. *It is new Logick to my underſtanding, that the Minor being ſealed, the Concluſion* eo nomine *is ſealed: The Minor of many an argument may be true, and the Concluſion falſe. And therefore when the caſe ſo falls out, that both Minor, and Concluſion are true or ſealed, it is not* eo nomine, *becauſe the Minor is true, that the Concluſion is ſo, (or is ſealed* eo nomine, *becauſe the Minor is ſo) but becauſe both Major and Minor are ſo, and not then neither, but upon ſuppoſition the ſyllogiſm be ſound.* It ſhould firſt have been made to appear that I vent ſuch Logick, and then I might more fairly have been charged with new Logick. I ſpake not of ſyllogiſmes in general, but of the ſyllogiſm I had in hand, and ſuch a one where the Major is taken for granted, as I ſay it is in that ſyllogiſm. The Major in that ſyllogiſm is laid down in theſe words; *If God give me Chriſt, he will give me juſtification, and ſal-*

vation

vation by Chriſt; which is clearly laid down by the Apoſtle *Rom.* 8, 32. The *Minor* is expreſſed in theſe words (as ſuppoſed to be the words of God in the tender of the Sacrament) *Here I give thee Chriſt*, upon which the Concluſion followes: Therefore *I give thee juſtification, and ſalvation.* The Major in this, I ſaid, pag. 41. is ſuppoſed, not ſealed; The Minor is there ſealed, giving in my reaſon, which is not oppoſed; and the Minor being ſealed, *I ſay*, the Concluſion is *eo nomine* ſealed. This is confeſſed, upon ſuppoſition, that the Syllogiſm is fouud to be ſound; and the Syllogiſm is not yet under any charge, and therefore what I ſay, by his own confeſſion is true. There is further put into the Index *Mr.* Bl's. *doctrine untrue, that* [*if the concluſion be not ſealed, then no propoſition is ſealed*] referring to Sect. 68. pag. 126. My words quarrelled at are theſe, pag. 42. [If the Propoſition ſerves directly to prove the concluſion, then that which directly confirmes any Propoſition in a rightly framed ſyllogiſm confirms the concluſion. If the concluſion is not ſealed, then no Propoſition is ſealed, or elſe the ſyllogiſm is ill framed.] The anſwer returned me is this, *This is too new doctrine to be received, without one word of proof: Doth he that ſealeth the Major of this following ſyllogiſm ſeal the concluſion? All that truely receive Chriſt, are the ſons of God, and ſhall be ſaved: Judas did truely receive Chriſt; Therefore* Judas *was the ſon of God, and ſhall be ſaved. I think both premiſes muſt be true, before the concluſion will thence be proved true: And it is not ſealed by God, when it is falſe.* I confeſſe I ſtand amazed at this picking of quarrels, and high ſtrains of wit, to find out matter for animadverſions; If the Minor Propoſition here expreſſed, directly ſerve to prove the concluſion, then *Judas* is ſaved: for if it ſerve directly to that purpoſe, it is neither in matter, nor form defective. If any ſhould wickedly ſay *R. B.* ſhall not be ſaved, and to make it good; ſhal affirm, that he is a pure Pagan, wholly ignorant of Jeſus Chriſt; will any ſay, that this directly proves it, when the proof contains ſuch an abominable falſehood? And ſuch is the proof here, that *Judas* is the ſon of God, and ſhall be ſaved; change *Judas* into *Peter*, and then you ſpeak my thoughts. He is pleaſed further to put into his Index, *Whether it be virtually written in Scripture that Mr.* Bl. *is juſtified?* I confeſſe I did not [without trembling of ſpirit read, nor without tears think upon this, thus put to the queſtion; together with that which followes, *Whether it be de fide that Mr.*

Bl.

Bl. *is juſtified?* Who would not believe, that I had directly aſſerted it, or made ſome unſavory vaunts about it? I muſt therefore give the Reader an account, that Mr. *Baxter* himſelf, Appen. pag. 66. had framed this ſyllogiſm in order to the finding out of the way of Sacraments ſealing; *He that believeth, and is juſtified ſhall be ſaved: But I believe: Therefore I am juſtified, and ſhall be ſaved*; affirming that this concluſion [*I ſhall be ſaved*] is no where written, to which I anſwered, Treat. of the Covenant, pag. 42. It is written vertually, though not expreſſely: making it clear by an other inſtance: it is no where written, that I ſhall riſe in judgement; yet it is on faith, that I ſhall ariſe, ſeeing it is written that all men ſhall ariſe; and when I have concluded faith in my heart, as well as reaſon in my ſoul, knowing my ſelf to be a believer, as I know my ſelf to be a man; I may as well conclude, that I ſhall ariſe to life, as that I ſhall ariſe to judgement. After ſome exceptions taken by him at the word [*vertually*] to prove if he could, that my ſyllogiſm is tautologicall, he adds, *Yet I confeſſe, that ſome concluſions may be ſaid to be* Interpretative vel ſecundum locutionem moralem *in Scripture, when but one of the premiſes is there: but that is when the other is preſuppoſed as being certain.* And do not I preſuppoſe the Minor here to be certain, in ſaying, When I have concluded faith in my heart, as well as reaſon in my ſoul, I ſpeak not to it, but upon this ſuppoſition, that it is concluded; And therefor the concluſion may be *Interpretative* in Scripture according to Mr. *Baxter*, though not *virtualiter*, and that ſhall ſerve my turn: And I think there is as much of tautology in the one as in the other. For my concluſion in that inſtance of ariſing again, it is ſaid that, *It is by faith and natural knowledge mixed, that I ſhall riſe again*; and I am further told, *Though in ſtrict ſenſe it be thus mixed: In our ordinary diſcourſe we muſt denominate it from one of the premiſes, and uſually from the more notable, alwayes from the more debile. Scripture ſaith, that all men ſhall riſe; reaſon ſaith, that you are a man. Though the concluſion here partake of both; yet it is moſt fitly ſaid to be* de fide, *both becauſe Scripture intended each particular man in the univerſal, and becauſe it is ſuppoſed as known to all that they are men: and therefore the other part is it that reſolves the doubt, and is the more notable, and more debile part.* To which I onely ſay, that of two premiſes the *debilior* ſhould be the more notable, or that a Propoſition which is

laid down *terminis terminantibus* of God himſelf ſhould be more weak, then that which reaſon concludes, I am to learn. I am further told, that *it is an undoubted truth with me, that concluſio ſequitur debiliorem partem*; That it followes *deteriorem partem*, I long ſince learnt, ſo that if one of the premiſes be falſe, the concluſion cannot be true; but that it muſt have its denomination *à debiliori*, in the ſenſe here ſpoken to, I never yet heard, nor could I have once thought, that upon the account of the weakneſſe of that Propoſition of faith, [*All men ſhould riſe*] it ſhould be yeelded to be of faith, that I ſhould riſe, and not otherwiſe. And here I am put to it to anſwer, whether *I have a fuller evidence, that I am a ſincere believer, then I have, that all ſincere believers are juſtified?* And am told, *It ſeemes by your following words, that you have or ſuppoſe others to have.* I wonder what words of mine thoſe are that ſpeak ſuch madneſſe. Can I be more ſure that I ſee the Sun, than I am that there is a Sun to be ſeen? I am yet told, *If you have as evidently concluded, that faith is in your heart (ſaving faith) as that reaſon is in your ſoul, and know your ſelf to be a believer, as evidently as you know your ſelf to be a man, then your concluſion may be denominated to be* de fide, *as* a parte debiliori. But what if any man have concluded, though not with that evidence, and full ſtrength of light, how it is hindred, but that ſtill it may be a concluſion *de fide*, I confeſſe I am to ſeek in this new learning, to enquire into premiſes, whether is *debilior*, whether *fortior*, and ſo to give the concluſion denomination *à debiliori*; what if I cannot tell in which of them moſt ſtrength lyes, (as it ſeems Mr. *Baxter* himſelf is ſometimes to ſeek) then I ſhall be at a ſtand, whether the concluſion is to be denominated of faith, or of ſenſe, or reaſon; I take it to be *de fide* when I have warrant from the Word of God for it, and it leads me to believe it.

Mr. *Baxter* had ſaid in his Appendix. *Otherwiſe* (that is, as I underſtand him, if this propoſition, I ſhall be ſaved, be ſealed in the Sacrament) *every man rightly receiving the ſeales, ſhall be juſtified and ſaved.* To this I have anſwered, I ſee no danger in yielding this concluſion; Every man rightly receiving, and improving the ſeales muſt be ſaved, and juſtified. He that rightly receives the ſeales, receives Chriſt in the ſeales, and receiving Chriſt, receives ſalvation. In his reply, he firſt explains himſelf, and then retorts upon me. He ſaies, *by rightly I meant having*

right

right to it, and that onely in foro Eccleſiæ, and not reſtè, and confeſſes he *ſhould plainlier have expreſſed his meaning*. Let him then bear with others if their words do not alwaies ſpeak their meaning ſo plainly as he would deſire. I think my meaning was never ſo in the cloudes, as his is here. He then retorts upon me, in theſe words, *Whether you here contradict not your doctrine of Baptiſmal faith, where you ſuppoſe juſtifying faith to be the thing promiſed by us in Baptiſme, and therefore not prerequiſite in it, I leave you to judge, and reſolve, as by your explication.* I have buſied my head not a little, to find out where any colour of contradiction lyes. If it be in this that I yield, that every man that rightly receives the Sacrament ſhall be ſaved, and yet affirm, that men that are not in a ſtate of ſalvation have right to Sacraments, then it is a contradiction to ſay, that any man may have true right to any thing that doth not rightly uſe it, which indeed is a contradiction much like to ſome others, with which I am charged, and might with as good reaſon have found a place in an *Index*.

Having yielded to Mr. *Baxter*, That Papiſts have great advantage given them by thoſe, that miſtaking the nature of juſtifying faith, think it conſiſts in a belief of the pardon of my own ſinnes. Yet to make it good, that the concluſion that my ſins are pardoned, or I ſhall be ſaved, may be *de fide*, when the ſoul hath a right proceeded in the premiſes; I ſay, As it is an error to hold, that to believe my ſinnes are forgiven, is of the nature, or eſſence of faith, as though none did believe, but thoſe that had attained ſuch aſſurance, (true faith hath aſſurance in purſuit onely, ſometimes, and not alwaies in poſſeſſion) ſo on the other hand, it is a miſtake to ſay, that it is no work of faith. The Apoſtle calls it the *full aſſurance of faith*, Heb. 10. 22. and deſcribeth faith to be *the ſubſtance of things hoped for*; faith realizeth ſalvation, which we have in hope to the ſoul. A deſcription of faith (ſaith Dr. *Ameſius* out of a Schoolman) by one of the moſt eminent acts that it produceth; therefore I take that to be a good anſwer that is here charged with error that when it is written, he that believeth is juſtified, it is equivalent, as though it were ſuch, or ſuch a man is juſtified, in caſe with aſſured grounds, and infallible demonſtrations, he can make it good to his own ſelf that he believeth. Upon this he comes in, not with a few animadverſions, the two firſt are to conclude from my

own mouth that aſſurance is not faith, in that I ſay it is not of the nature and eſſence of faith, and hath it ſometimes onely in purſuit, and not in poſſeſſion. In which he ſeems to take for granted that I had affirmed that aſſurance is faith, when I can produce witneſſes that almoſt 30. years ago I have oppoſed it, and I ſtill perſiſt in the denyal of it. 3. He ſaies, *I know none that deny aſſurance to be a work of faith, which Mr.* Bl. *ſaith here is a miſtake, to ſay love and obedience are works of faith, but not faith it ſelf.* A work I mean as my words import, attainable by faith, and if faith by Scripture-promiſes, is able to conclude it, then the concluſion with me is *de fide* when it is concluded. 4. He ſaies, *I muſt have better proof before I can believe that it is aſſurance of our own ſincerity, or actual juſtification, which the Apoſtle calls the full aſſurance of faith,* Heb. 10.22. And I think he is the firſt man amongſt orthodox Divines, that hath doubted that aſſurance of acceptance, is meant in that place. *Faith is that grace* (ſay the laſt Annotations) *whereby we either do, or may approach unto God, with full aſſurance of acceptance.* Is not that boldneſſe in our addreſſes mentioned, ver. 19. an evident ſymptome of it? And is not ſincerity ſet forth in thoſe words [*having our hearts ſprinkled from an evil conſcience, and our bodies waſhed with pure water*] as the baſis, or bottome of it, not of our acceptance, but of our aſſurance? I muſt hear ſomewhat more, before I can queſtion it. There followes. 5. *And as hardly can I diſcern aſſurance of our ſincerity in the deſcription of faith,* Heb. 11.1. *unleſſe you mean that hope is part of faith, and aſſurance the ſame with hope, both which need more proof. Hope may be without aſſurance, and when it is joyned with it, yet is not the ſame thing; onely ſuch aſſurance is a ſingular help to the exerciſe of hope.* And can you not diſcern a douhle *encomium* of faith in thoſe words? The firſt with reſpect to things paſt and preſent, as well as things to come, where it is ſaid to be *The evidence of things not ſeen.* Faith makes that evident, which otherwiſe would not be known. The other reſpective to things to come, and that not evil, but onely good; not things feared, but hoped; expreſſed in theſe words, *Faith is the ſubſtance of things hoped for;* both of them rather expreſſing what faith does, then what faith is; and I know not why that ſpeech of hope ſhould be brought in here, when it is onely ſaid, that the good things hoped for, are that which faith realizes to the ſoul. It is ſaid further. 6. *It*

is

is true that faith may be ſaid (as you ſpeak) to realize ſalvation to the ſoul; that is, when the ſoul doubteth, whether there be indeed ſuch a glory and ſalvation to be expected, and enjoyed by believers as Chriſt hath promiſed ere faith apprehendeth it as real, or certain, and ſo reſolves the doubt. And is this all that faith can poſſibly do, and for which this high praiſe is here given unto it? Againſt this I ſay; Firſt, This was expreſſed in the former branch, *the evidence of things not ſeen*; faith believes a heaven, as well as a creation. Secondly; a faith ſhort of juſtifying may do this, an hiſtorical faith aſſents to the higheſt dogmatical truthes. Thirdly, will you have the *full aſſurance of hope*, Heb. 6. 11. to be no other, then to get aſſurance that there is a heaven, though we ſhall never come to heaven? which would be a contradiction; for hope hath poſſeſſion in expectation. Fourthly, doth not our hope *enter into that within the vail, whither our forerunner is gone before us?* Heb. 6. 19. and are we not *ſaved by hope?* Rom. 8. 24. Faith then being ſaid to be *the ſubſtance of things hoped for*, it doth not barely tell us that there is a heaven, (that is too lank and lean a commendation of it) but the office of it is to realize the poſſeſſion of it to us. It followes, *But when the doubt is, whether I be a true believer, faith reſolves it not.* Faith hath its hand in the reſolving of this doubt, in believing from the Scriptures, what are the Symptomes, or cognizances of trne believing, and gathering them up by reflex upon it ſelf. It followes, *And when the doubt is, whether this certain glory, and ſalvation ſhall be mine, faith onely cooperateth to the reſolve of it, by affording us one of the propoſitions, but not both, and not wholly the concluſion.* If faith affords us one of the propoſitions, and findes the other in the Scriptures, that is to me ſufficient. It followes. 7. *I am of Dr.* Ameſius *his mind, that it is one of faiths moſt eminent acts, by which it is there deſcribed.* But undoubtedly you were not ſo in your ſixth animadverſion, when you left it ſo low, as we have heard, and made it no more then the faith of wicked men may reach. There is added, *But ſo think not they that tell us, that is none of the inſtrumental juſtifying act which is there deſcribed.* But doubtleſſe they may very well think ſo. This here mentioned is a more eminent work of faith, then that of juſtifying, as a child on a Giants head is further removed from the earth, and nearer the clouds then the Giant himſelf; Faith that gives aſſurance, preſuppoſeth the

juſtifying

juſtifying act already done by it ſelf, and addes more to it, when a man believes ſavingly there is *Certitudo objecti*, he that believes ſhall be ſaved, but this here mentioned is, *Certitudo ſubjecti*, when the good hoped for is aſſured to the ſoul. If there be any other promiſe made of God for good, this work of faith I confeſſe takes it in, and I do not believe that the Apoſtle doth limit this work of faith to the hope of ſalvation, but I am ſure he doth not exclude it; that being the chiefeſt thing in our hope, that is undoubtedly chiefly intended, and might well by me be mentioned. It followes. 8. *This which you took to be a good anſwer, is that great miſtake which hath ſo hardened the Papiſts againſt us; and were it not for this point, I ſhould not have deſired much to have ſaid any thing to you of the reſt, about conditional ſealing, as being confident, that we mean the ſame thing in the main.* If that be that great miſtake, I am ſtill in the miſtake, and you are the firſt man that ever went about to rectifie it; but you herein fail, that you ſhew not wherein the miſtake lies. Thoſe Divines that deny faith to be aſſurance (that were as much as to define a man by ſuch excellencies that are to be found in few men, and ſo to exclude the common pitch of men from the ſpecies of mankind) do not yet deny but that faith may attain to aſſurance. It followes. 9. *You forſake them that uſe to give this anſwer, when you confine it to thoſe onely that with aſſured grounds and infallible demonſtrations can make it good to themſelves that they believe*, i. e. *ſavingly*. I think that they as well as I, confine it to thoſe that you here mention. It followes, *I doubt that anſwer then will hold but to very few if you mean by aſſured grounds &c. ſuch as they are actually aſſured, are good and demonſtrative.* I believe that *ſtrait is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth to life, and few there be that find it.* There are not many, we may fear, that do ſavingly believe, and many of thoſe are not yet aſſured that they do believe; and to this Mr. *Baxter* hath ſpoke abundantly ſufficient in his Saints reſt. It followes. 10. *Demonſtrations may be infallible, and yet not known to be ſuch to the perſon: but I ſuppoſe that by the word demonſtration, you intend that the party diſcerns it to be an infallible demonſtration: which ſure intimates a very high kind of certainty.* You may well know that I intend ſo, when you ſee that I ſay ſo, and I do not make that to be aſſurance, *cui poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*; If it prove in the event otherwiſe, it was not aſſurance. It followes. 11. *Yet*

even

even in that caſe I deny that the general Premiſe in the Major is equivalent to the concluſion, I am juſtified, and ſhall be ſaved, though I ſhould acknowledg that the concluſion may be ſaid to be de fide, in that the Major hath the predominant intereſt in the concluſion; if ſo be that the man have better evidence of his ſincerity then of the truth of the promiſe. Neither do I ſay that that Propoſition, He that believes, and repents ſhall be ſaved, is of it ſelf equivalent with that concluſion, without the aſſumption with Scripture-warrant, and help of the Spirit, that I believe and repent; and I know not what to make of ſuch ſtrange ſuppoſals of a better evidence of a mans own ſincerity in any man, then of the truth of the promiſe which Mr. *Baxter* preſently affirms to be a contradiction. There is no man comes up to ſincerity, but he that is aſſured by faith, that the promiſe is true; Though he may be ſometimes ſtaggered, yet he riſes out of it, and holds faſt to the truth of the promiſe; and when the ſoul hath evidence of both, and is aſſured of both, I ſay, the concluſion is *de fide*; ſee Mr. *Ball* of faith, pag. 80.

Mr. *Baxter* ſayes, Appen. pag. 71. *When the Papiſts alleadge, that it is no where written* [*that ſuch, or ſuch a man is juſtified*] *we anſwer them, that it being written* [*that he that believeth, is juſtified*] *this is equivalent. A groſſe miſtake,* (ſaith he) *as if the Major Propoſition alone were eqnivalent to the concluſion, or as if the concluſion muſt, or can be meerly* credenda, *a proper object of faith, when but one of the premiſes is matter of faith, and the other of ſenſe and knowledge.* In my Treatiſe of the Covenant, I oppoſed againſt him Dr. *Goades* ſpeech in a conference, expreſſing himſelf in theſe words, I will maintain the contrary againſt you, (*viz. Fiſher* the Jeſuite) that a concluſion may be *de fide*, although both Propoſitions be not *de fide*, but one of them otherwiſe, and infallibly true by the light of reaſon, or experience, giving inſtance in ſuch a ſyllogiſm. Mr. *Baxters* anſwers, Sect. 75. *Dr. Goad ſaith but the ſame that I ſay, onely I diſtinguiſh, &c.* And I am well content then to ſay what both of them ſay, and leave it to the Reader to take the benefit of his large and elaborate diſcourſe on this occaſion.

He is pleaſed to put into his *Index*, *the difference between Mr.* Bl. *and me contracted, and a plain cogent argument added to prove, that the concluſion forementioned is not ſealed*, which is the work of

of Sect. 76. pag. 139. In which much by him is granted, and much affirmed; to which I aſſent. His cogent argument that the concluſion [I ſhall be ſaved] is not ſealed, is thus framed, *Concluſio ſequitur partem debiliorem, vel deteriorem; At propoſitio non obſignata, eſt pars debilior, vel deterior; Ergo concluſio ſequitur propoſitionem non obſignatam.* I ſhall give it in Engliſh, that if poſſible all may underſtand us. *The Concluſion followes the weaker or worſer part: But the Propoſition unſealed is the weaker, or worſer part: Therefore the concluſion followes the Propoſition unſealed.* And after many words he ſayes, *For my part, I know not what objection can be made againſt either part of the forecited argument (the Major being a common Canon or Rule that holds in all figures, and the Minor being yeeled by your ſelf) elſe I would anſwer to it.* To this I might have many things to ſay. Firſt, That Mr. *Baxter* knowes, that I did not allow of any ſuch Syllogiſm as this, which he thus frames in order to find out the ſealing of the Sacraments, and therefore what is here ſealed or not ſealed, with me is little to the purpoſe.

Secondly, I marvel that he makes *debilior*, and *deterior*, *weaker*, and *worſer*, here to be both one, when before he made a Scripture Propoſition to be *debilior*, the *weaker*, and a Propoſition of reaſon *fortior*, the *ſtronger*; when I ſhould be loath to make, or conceive (as neceſſarily he does) a Scripture-Propoſition to be *deterior*, the *worſer*.

Thirdly, As to the Syllogiſm, I ſhall call for proof of both his premiſes; For the Major, in his ſenſe (if I underſtand it) I either deny, or much queſtion it, and therefore diſtinguiſh of that which is ſaid to be *worſer*, or *weaker*; which may be, either reſpective to the truth of the premiſes; and then I yeeld, that the concluſion ever followes the worſer. If either Propoſition be falſe, the Concluſion is not true; But this ſo far as I underſtand is not his meaning: *Or* they may be taken reſpective to the nature of them, and then I know not that the denomination of the Concluſion muſt follow upon account, either of ſtrength or weakneſſe in either of the premiſes. For the *Minor* Propoſition, That an unſealed Propoſion is the weaker, or worſer part, I ſhall deſire to know the quantity of it, if it be univerſal, then it is falſe; Every unſealed Propoſition is not weaker, or worſer then that which is ſealed. And whereas Mr. *Baxter* ſayes, I have yeelded it; I know not, that ever I was put upon it: but now I

ſhall

shall speak my whole sense of it. I yeeld that a seal adds to the strength as does an oath, and therefore an unsealed Proposition is weaker, then that which is sealed *cæteris paribus*, all things being otherwise alike in both, yet there may be those differences in Propositions, that a Proposition may be of that strength in it self that it needs no seal, and be every way equal for truth, and evidence to those that are sealed, and thousands of such might be named, that without any seal are of equal strength to those to which a seal is added. That there are lands, or tenements in the County of *Salop* is a Proposition without a seal, that *R. B.* hath lands or tenements in that County is a Proposition under seal, yet the latter hath no more strength or evidence of truth then the former. He that hath lands lineally descending upon him from his Ancestors hath a true right to inherit, is a Proposition without a seal: *R. B.* hath such an inheritance is a Proposition under seal; and I desire to know whether here be not as much truth and evidence in the Major as the Minor. Let us look into that Syllogism which I put, to find out that which the Sacrament seals, and that in the person of God himself pronounced. To whom I give Christ, I give all things: But I give to thee Christ: *Ergo.* The first is without seal, the second in the Sacrament is under seal; yet there is as much evidence of truth in the first, as in the second. Mr. *Baxters* Minor Proposition must have its due limit (as before) or else it is to be denyed.

The last thing in his Index as to this controversie is, *The danger of teaching men, that they are bound to believe that they are justified, and shall be saved*; which referres to Sect. 81. pag. 142. Where I am in the first place handsomely taken up, for saying I recede not from any that heretofore I have published on this subject, as standing not with ingenuity, when himself in the next Paragraphe runs on the same error, if an error; resolving to maintain what he had asserted: I am afterwards told, *It hath been too common a doctrine amongst the most renowned Divines, that it is not onely,* de fide *that I* A. B. *am justified, but every mans duty also; yea, part of the Creed, and so a fundamental for to believe that our sins are remitted, (for so they expound the Article of remission of sins) yea, they earnestly presse men to believe the pardon in particular, and tell them they have but the faith of Devils else. By which dangerous doctrine* (it is said) 1. *Most men are perswaded*

The safety or danger to teach men to believe that they are justified and shall be saved.

ſwaded to believe a falſehood, for moſt are not forgiven. 2. *The careleſſe world is driven on faſter to preſumption, to which they are ſo prone of themſelves.* 3. *Painfull Miniſters are hindred, and their labours fruſtrated, whoſe buſineſſe is firſt to break mens falſe hopes, and peace, which they find ſo hard a work, that they need no reſiſtance, &c.* I believe that, as Mr. *Baxter* ſayes, this may be dangerouſly done; and I believe, that it hath not been urged by ſome without great danger; yet I alſo believe, that it may ſafely, & comfortably in due order be done, and that Miniſters of Chriſt orderly and in a Goſpel-method ought to do it. For the Creed, I am ſo far from this error here mentioned, that I go not ſo farre in this thing as Mr. *Baxter* himſelf, as I have obſerved in this Apology. I do not think that the Creed it ſelf calls for ſo much as faith of adherence, to reſt or rely upon Chriſt for remiſſion of ſins; I ſuppoſe Creeds and Confeſſions of faith are onely for declaration of the doctrine that we hold, to difference us from thoſe that in thoſe particulars are erroneous in judgement, and do not at all intermeddle with our will or affections. Though I know the will muſt conſent, and by the affections imbrace and receive Chriſt, or elſe there is no ſalvation to which the Goſpel calls us.

The danger mentioned I fear too often (as I ſaid before) is ſadly incurred, that brand of falſe Prophets, *Ezek.* 13.22,23. is heavy, *Becauſe with lyes ye have made the heart of the righteous ſad, whom I have not made ſad, & ſtrengthened the hands of the wicked, that he ſhould not return from his wicked way, by promiſing him life: Therfore ye ſhall ſee no more vanity, nor divine divinations; for I will diliver my people out of your hands, and ye ſhall know that I am the Lord.* This practice is in full oppoſition to God, (who every where threatens death to wicked perſons) which as many obſerve well all the error of thoſe that ſuffered the charge of falſe Prophets among the Jewes; we read not that they delivered any poſitive untruths, but onely made undue applications. And therefore falſe Prophets among them, are diſtinguiſhed from falſe teachers, which were to ariſe in Chriſtian Churches, 2 *Pet.* 2.1 The latter, and not the former bringing in damnable hereſies, and yet the former were of like danger in their miſapplication, both of promiſes, and threatenings, and more eſpecially of promiſes; to urge all to believe, that in *ſtatu quo*, they ſhall be ſaved, is indeed to teach them to preſume, ſeeing ſalvation is not every mans portion

tion, and the portion of no man that lyes in ſin: It was a doctrine that the Apoſtle often preacht, that ſuch ſhould not inherit the Kingdom of heaven, *Gal.*5.21. and he lets the *Epheſians* know that all thoſe are but vain deceiving words that teach otherwayes, *Epheſ.*5.6. Yet I ſuppoſe that it is a Chriſtians priviledge, that he may believe that his ſins are forgiven, and that he ſhall be ſaved; and being his priviledge, it is alſo his duty. Chriſt requires ſome to believe it, Be of good cheer, thy ſins are forgiven, *Matth.*9.2. And the Apoſtle takes it for granted, that ſome were aſſured; Ye have ſuffered joyfully the ſpoiling of your goods, knowing that in heaven ye have a better and far more induring ſubſtance, *Heb.*10.34. Why doth *Peter* call upon Chriſtians, to give diligence to make their calling and Election ſure? 2 *Pet.*1.10. Or why did *John* write to thoſe that believe on the Name of the Son of God, that they might know that they have eternal life, 1 *Joh.*5.13. in caſe they may not be aſſured, and accordingly by faith be fully perſwaded and ſatisfied in it? We may not think that aſſurance is held out in Scriptures as a Chimæra, or as a Chymiſts Philoſophers Stone, to be talked of, but never compaſſed. And I ſuppoſe *ſano ſenſu*, and with due qualifications it may be aſſerted, That every viſible Church-member is bound to believe his own ſalvation, and the pardon of his own ſins in particular. I well remember that I had once conference with Mr. *Ball* in Mr. *Aſh's* houſe on this thing, (upon occaſion of that old argument inſiſted upon by Arminians; That which all are bound to believe is true: But all are bound to believe that Chriſt dyed for them) and he determined that all are bound to believe that Chriſt dyed for them in particular, and that all the fruits of his death ſhall be theirs, not immediately, but *Mediante fide & reſipiſcentia*; Men are bound to faith and repentance, and upon their faith and repentance are bound to get this aſſurance, which it ſeems is alſo Mr. *Baxters* thoughts by that which he adds in the fifth place for aggravation of this danger, when wicked men that have but the faith of Divels, are immediately required to believe the pardon of their own particular ſins, and this made to be *de fide*, God is diſhonoured with the charge of ſuch untruths, as if falſehoods were *de fide*, and God commanded men to believe them. It ſeems then that he grants that men may be mediately required to believe the pardon of their own ſins in particular, and there can never be too much

ſpoken againſt an urging of it in an immediate way; It is after we have done the will of God that we ſhall receive the promiſe, *Heb.*10.36. and we muſt not believe that without doing his will we ſhall ever receive it. Promiſe-preachers that are not duty-preachers, that hold out bliſſe, and never ſpeak of the terms or means to attain it, are no other then deceivers. To ſpeak largely of the Fathers bowels to receive, and not a word of the Prodigals duty to come in, or the multitude of ſins that were forgiven that ſinner in the City (ſuppoſed to be *Mary Magdalen*) and conceal her tears of repentance; to be large in one, and ſilent in the other, is the way to heal with ſlight words. Whereas Mr. *Baxter* ſayes, *The ungodly that I deal with are ſo confident that their ſin is forgiven, and God will not damn them for it, that all that I can ſay, is too little to ſhake their confidence, which is the nurſe of their ſin.* When he makes this his buſineſſe, he does the work of the Prophets, of *John Baptiſt*, and of Chriſt Jeſus; and I wiſh that all the labourers in the Lords work may joyn with him in that way, and that the Lord may give ſucceſſe. Yet I ſtill believe that all this is to be done in order to a well ſetled, and firmly grounded confidence: when he tells thoſe that come to Chriſt, and hear his words, and do them not: clayming ſalvation by him, and not obeying him, that they build their hopes on a ſandy foundation, and fooliſhly deceive themſelves; I believe that he tells thoſe that hear, and accordingly yeeld obedience, that their hopes of ſalvation have a firm bottom as a houſe built upon a rock. But I know not why all of this ſhould here in this place be brought in; in the cloſe of all that hath paſt (as he ſayes) concerning himſelf, unleſſe it be, to bear men in hand, that my doctrine of conditional ſealing in the Sacraments, (which he yet confeſſes differs little from his own) may be charged with this danger, when I ſuppoſe it is the alone way of prevention of it. If I ſhould make the words of the inſtitution an abſolute tender, and the ſeal wholly unconditional, I know not how to avoid it; and I may very well fear, that he cannot be without ſome ſuch meaning. Firſt, In that he puts into his Index (as we have heard) *The danger of teaching men that they are bound to believe that they are juſtified, and ſhall be ſaved,* amidſt thoſe things, in which none but I are concerned; and Secondly, Where he firſt begins with me he utters like language, pag.3. *I doubt not* (ſayes he) *but the difference between you and me, is onely*

about

about the methodizing of our notions, and not de ſubſtantia rei, *and yet* preſently adds, *but I doubt leſt your doctrine being received by common heads, according to the true importancy of the expreſſion may do more againſt their ſalvation then is well thgouht on, and that not by accidence, but from its own nature, ſuppoſing the impreſſion of the ſoul to be but anſwerable to the objective doctrinal ſeal:* How unhappy am I in methodizing of wholeſome truths, which are the ſame in ſubſtance with a mans of ſuch eminence? If that alone ſhould have ſuch a ſad influence upon mens underſtanding, though age growes upon me, and many other weakneſſes; yet were I ſenſible of the truth of this charge, I would travel on foot to the remoteſt ground in *England* to learn from any hand a more happy way, and I have therefore been more large, that the Reader may ſee the whole of my thoughts in this where I may ſeem to be under ſo heavy a cenſure, that he may help me in prayer, that in all that I do I may edifie, and not deſtroy.

SECT. II.

Corollaries from the former doctrine.

Chriſts tender care evidenced in his condeſcenſion to our weakneſſe.

LEt us here ſee the *goodneſſe of God, the ſingular tender care of Chriſt, thus to condeſcend to our weakneſſe, as to vouchſafe theſe viſible, ſenſible pledges, and confirmations of our faith in the promiſes.* All that can be thought upon to ratifie, and make good whatſoever, from any hand we have in expectation, Chriſt hath been pleaſed in his condeſcenſion to vouchſafe unto us. In ſuch a caſe we deſire, 1. A promiſe, that he from whom we expect it, would engage himſelf by his word for it. This Chriſt hath done in the Goſpel-promiſes, we have his promiſe frequently repeated, ſtill inculcated, *Gen.* 32. 12. *And thou ſaidſt, I will ſurely do thee good, and make thy ſeed as the ſand of the Sea, which cannot be numbred for multitude,* 1 Tim. 4. 8. *Godlineſſe is profitable unto all things, having the promiſe of the life that now is, and of that which is to come,* Joh. 11. 25. *I am the reſurrection, and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet he ſhall live.* 2. When we have a word, we yet deſire an oath, that the perſon by

by that ſacred tye, may be obliged not to recede, or go back from that which he hath ſpoke; This God hath vouchſafed. when God made promiſe to *Abraham, becauſe he could ſwear by no greater, he ſware by himſelf, that by two immutable things in which it was impoſſible for God to lye, we might have a ſtrong conſolation, who have fled for refuge, to lay hold upon the hope ſet before us.* 3. When we have both word, and oath, yet we deſire his hand, that it may be ſubſcribed, that we may have ſomewhat to produce and ſhew for that which we expect; This God hath vouchſafed, *Joh.* 20. 31. *Theſe are written that ye might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Sonne of God, and that believing ye might have life through his Name,* Rom. 15. 4. *Whatſoever things were written afore-time, were written for our learning, that we through patience, and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope.* 4. Yet we deſire earneſt, a pledge in hand, to make good what is in Covenant, and promiſe paſt, and by oath under hand confirmed; This God is pleaſed to vouchſafe, *Epheſ.* 1. 13. *In whom alſo after that ye believed, ye were ſealed with that holy Spirit of promiſe, which is the earneſt of our inheritance, untill the redemption of the purchaſed poſſeſſion,* 2 Cor. 1. 21, 22. *Now he which eſtabliſheth us with you in Chriſt, and hath anointed us, is God, who hath alſo ſealed us, and given the earneſt of the Spirit in our hearts.* 5. We yet deſire a ſeal, As *Jeremy* had the evidences of his purchaſe, *Jer.* 32. 10. This God hath alſo vouchſafed, and this is of two ſorts. 1. Inward by his own immediate hand, the ſtamp of his Spirit, the impreſſe of his grace. This is the character, or mark that we are his, theſe God ſets apart for himſelf, *Epheſ.* 1. 13. *Epheſ.* 4. 30 1 *Cor.* 2. 21, 22. 2. Outward put into the hands of his Miniſters, and theſe are Sacraments, theſe outward viſible aſſurances. The former needs no conditions but it ſelf, all ſanctified are ſaved, and ſanctification is the ſeal, there are all Goſpel-conditions. The latter requires all the gracious qualifications of a people in Covenants. All that are thus qualified, according to the Goſpel, have here full confirmation, and aſſurance of intereſt in all promiſes; ſo willing is God every way to condeſcend to our weakneſſe, to anſwer what infirmity can expect, or feebleneſſe crave. We might think that *Gideon* was exceeding bold with God, to ask a double ſign for the ſtrengthening of his faith in the promiſe of God, to ſave *Iſrael* by his hand; yet we ſee God is pleaſed to gratify him, *Judg* 6. 39, 40.

yet

yet God deales more abundantly with us, not onely in a double, but a multiplied confirmation, to make good every truth which he hath been pleaſed to manifeſt. And as he teacheth us by ſimilitudes drawn from earthly things, as we ſee in the Prophets, and parables from our Saviours mouth, ſo alſo to ſpeak to our eyes, in theſe ſignes and ſeales ratifying, and confirming heavenly things unto us. Thoſe great mercies which no thought can reach. are ſet out in ſo obvious a way, that every eye doth behold and ſee. That water which we employ for our common uſe, and among other neceſſary ſervices cleanſes all filth that cleaves to us, ſerves to ſet out that great myſtery of the blood and Spirit of Chriſt, taking away both guilt and filth of ſin. The bread which we have at our table, the wine which we drink for our food and repaſt, that ſets out both the attonement, and divine nouriſhment, which our ſoules find in the fleſh and blood of Chriſt crucified and dying for us. There is abundant weakneſſe and tottering in our faith, that needs in this manner to be ſtrengthened. Abundance of ſweet mercies in our God that will vouchſafe this to ſtrengthen and ſupport us.

Secondly, If Chriſt thus condeſcends to our weakneſſe, in making proviſion of theſe helps, let us learn to have compaſſion of our ſelves, and not neglect, or deſpiſe ſo great favours. If Chriſt had judged us to have been of ſtrength, he had never tendred us this crutch; and when he ſees that we need it, and therefore hath provided it, let us ſee that we do not reject, or deſpiſe it. Is it not to imitate *Ahaz* in his obſtinacy, who when he could not believe the promiſe that God would deliver him, and his people from the combined power of *Iſrael*, and *Syria*, that were then before *Jeruſalem*, and having a ſign tendred him of God, either in the depth beneath or the height above, for his aſſurance in the thing, he anſwers, *he will not deſire a ſign*, Iſa. 7. 11, 12. he will rather dwell in his unbelief, and periſh. As that ſign was to that promiſe, ſo all Sacraments are to Gods great promiſe. He that caſts away Sacraments indulges unbelief, and we may well fear, that he ſhall dwell in it to deſtruction.

Chriſts compaſſion towards us ſhould move us to compaſſionate our ſelves.

Chap. XI.

CHAP. XI. SECT. I.

The whole of the work of Sacraments is by way of ſign and ſeal.

The whole office and uſe of Sacraments.

THe next obſervation followes.

All that the Sacraments work on the ſoules of receivers, is by way of ſign and ſeal. They have no immediate effects for the working of any inward graces or priviledges, but as our underſtanding is exerciſed by them, as Indicative ſignes, and our faith, as ratifications and ſeales of the promiſes.

The Context opened.

The text that we have under our hand is abundantly full to this purpoſe; Scarce any text holds out a truth (I may ſay) more clear and full, then this text doth; that which is here delivered if we take in the context with it, to which the copulative [*And*] leads. The Apoſtle having in the former Chapter delivered the doctrine of juſtifi cation by faith, goes on here to make it good by the Example of *Abraham*, and his argument rendred in ſyllogiſtical form appears to be this: As *Abraham* the father of the faithful was juſtified, ſo muſt all the faithful. This is taken for granted, as needing no proof: But *Abraham* the father of the faithful was juſtified, not by works, but by faith. The Aſſumption conſiſts of two parts, and the Apoſtle proves both. 1. The negative that he was not juſtified by works, this he proves by two arguments. 1. If he were juſtified by works, then he hath whereof to glory, ver. 2. But he hath not whereof to glory before God; *Ergo* he was not juſtified by works. 2. If he were juſtified by works, the reward were reckoned not of grace, but of debt, ver. 4. But the reward is not of debt, but of grace: *Ergo.* Which he further confirmes by the teſtimony of *David*, deſcribing the bleſſedneſſe of man to whom the Lord imputeth righteouſneſſe without works, ſaying, *Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven, and whoſe ſinnes are covered. Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute ſin*, ver. 7, 8. As *David* deſcribes bleſſedneſſe, that way man is bleſſed; But *David* deſcribes it to be by imputation of righteouſneſſe, and not by works: *Ergo.* The affirmative that *Abraham* was juſtified by faith, he

prove

proves by a full teſtimony of Scripture, *Gen.* 15. 6. *He believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteouſneſſe.* Now it might be objected, that this juſtification of *Abraham*, and bleſſedneſſe that *David* ſpeaks of, was nothing to the Gentiles uncircumciſed, but to the Jewes in the ſtate of Circumciſion, and ſo Circumciſion may yet have an hand in juſtiſtification. This the Apoſtle denies, ver. 10. and proves the contrary by the time of *Abraham's* juſtification, which was in uncircumciſion, not in Circumciſion. If *Abraham* were juſtified in uncircumciſion, then Circumciſion, hath no hand in juſtification; But *Abraham* was juſtified in uncircumciſion. *Ergo*: But then the greateſt queſtion is, to what end or purpoſe he was circumciſed, having already that righteouſneſſe which doth juſtify, what needs more? Circumciſion then might have been let alone. The Apoſtle anſwers that he was circumciſed on a twofold account, for a double reaſon. The firſt is in reference to his own eſtate in faith, which equally concerns all in his ſtate of believing. *He received the ſign of Circumciſion, a ſeal of the faith which he had being yet uncircumciſed.* The ſecond in reference to the whole Church, *that he might be the Father of all that believe*, in Circumciſion or in uncircumciſion; ſo that we have both the Apoſtles authority and his argumentative diſcourſe for confirmation of our point, That the work and efficacy of Sacraments is by way of ſign and ſeal. We ſhall find *Peter* giving his vote with *Paul* in this thing (where he enters a diſpute about Baptiſme, as *Paul* here doth about Circumciſion, as you may find, 1 *Pet.* 3. 20, 21.) having mentioned Gods long ſuffering towards diſobedient ones, in the daies of *Noah*, while the Ark was a preparing, he ſaies; *Few, that is, eight ſoules were ſaved by water.* That element which (as an executioner of divine vengeance) deſtroyed the world of the ungodly, as an inſtrument in the hand of God, preſerved *Noah* and his family. It deſtroyed the world by overwhelming of them, as after it did *Pharaoh* and his hoſt. It ſaved *Noah* and his houſehold by keeping the Ark above trees, rocks, mountaines, buildings, or whatſoever might have been their ruine. Then he parallells Baptiſme with it; *The like figure whereunto even Baptiſme doth alſo now ſave us, not the putting away the filth of the fleſh, but the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God by the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt*; which according to Interpreters, implyes no more then a reſemblance, or, as *Calvin* ſpeaks, a

correſpondence, though, *Heb.* 9. 24. the Apoſtle uſeth the ſame word otherwiſe. The Ark then ſaved a few, when the reſt were deſtroyed; Baptiſme now ſaves a few by the reſurrection of Chriſt. *It will alwaies be* (ſaith *Calvin* on the words) *as it was in Noahs daies, when mankind runnes on their own ruine, God wonderfully ſaves ſome from the common deſtruction.* But here an objection lies, that *Noahs* Ark, and New Teſtament Baptiſme are nothing, parallell, few entred that, but now numerous, or rather innumerable multitudes are baptized. The Apoſtle anſwers, that the parallell lyes not between the outward Baptiſme, that is, the outward act, as man adminiſters it, which he calls putting away the filth of the fleſh, which we know is the work of Baptiſme, but the anſwer of a good conſcience, or the reſtipulation of a good conſcience. I deſire now to know how the Apoſtle can be ſalved from a contradiction. He ſaies, Baptiſme ſaves, and yet ſaies, the outward putting away the filth of the fleſh doth not ſave, but the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God. Now this putting away the filth of the fleſh, done in the Name of Chriſt, or in the Name of the Father, Sonne, and holy Ghoſt, is Baptiſme; ſo is not the anſwer of a good conſcience, that is no Baptiſme. The Apoſtle then ſhould rather have ſaid, that the anſwer of a good conſcience ſaves, and not Baptiſme. But he ſaies, Baptiſme ſaves. I ſee no other way of reconciliation, or to make ſenſe of his words, then to underſtand him that Baptiſme ſaves, as it hath its work on the conſcience, as it works upon our underſtanding, and our faith as a ſign and ſeal, and is no immediate conveyance of happineſſe, not any other way of conveyance, then as it hath its work on the conſcience of the receivers.

Reaſons confirming.

Reaſons. Firſt, The Word and Sacraments work after one and the ſame manner on the ſoul for ſalvation, reſpective to any mediate, or immediate way of conveyance of any graces or priviledges. This is evident, in regard of that relation that the Sacraments have to the Word, as appendants to it. But the force of the Word on the ſoul to ſalvation is not inherent, not by any immediate conveyance of inward graces or priviledges, but as it hath its work on the underſtanding, and faith of him that receiveth it; they that underſtand not are as the highway-ground that gaines nothing. It is the *power of God for ſalvation to them that believe*, Rom. 1. 16. It profits not where it is not mixt with faith, *Heb.* 4. 2. It is effectual onely in thoſe that believe, 1 *Theſ.* 2. 13. The bare

work

work done in hearing ſaves none, and ſo alſo it is with Sacraments.

Secondly, Signes and pledges added to promiſes, are efficacious no other wayes then as they work upon the underſtanding and faith of thoſe that receive them as ſignes, This may be made good in particular inſtances, in a large induction of ſignes of all ſorts. The double ſign vouchſafed of God to *Gideon* for his confirmation in the deliverance of *Iſrael*, Judg. 6. did not work at all towards ſuch a deliverance further then as it had its work upon the underſtanding and faith of *Gideon*, to whom it was given. The Scarlet thred in *Rahabs* window had no power for her ſafety, further then it was a ſign between her and *Joſhua*, minding *Joſhua* of his engagement to her. The rainbowe is of no power to ſave the world from an univerſal deluge of water, further then it minds and aſſures us of Gods promiſe. The ſame we may ſay of all ſignes and pledges both humane and divine: But Sacraments are ſignes, and pledges added to promiſes, as we ſee here in the text: Sacraments then have no other efficacy then, as they work on the underſtanding and faith of the receivers.

Thirdly, There is nothing that is material, ſenſible, corporeal, that hath any immediate influence, or operation upon any object that is ſpiritual. This is plain. There muſt be proportion between the agent, and the patient, the inſtrument working, and the object wrought upon: But the Sacramental ſignes that we receive as ſeales are material, corporeal, ſenſible; and therefore have no ſuch immediate influence upon the ſoul for the work of grace, or conveyance of it.

Fourthly, If this Scripture hold out the work of Sacraments, onely by way of ſign and ſeal, and no other Scripture holds out any other work to be wrought by them in the ſoul, then this is the whole of their work. This is clear, Scripture muſt ſomewhere hold out the whole, that Sacraments effect: But this is the whole that the Apoſtle in this Scripture gives to them, where he gives an account of the fruit of *Abrahams* Circumciſion, neither is there any other Scripture in which any more is attributed to the working of Sacraments. The aſſumption is of two parts, The firſt none can queſtion, that the Apoſtle aſcribes no more here to Sacraments then as hath been ſaid. For the ſecond, that no other Scripture aſcribes any thing further to them, ſhall God willing be made good, when we come to examine thoſe Scriptures which are brought in by way of objection for a further work.

If any would see authorities quoted of men of eminent name, that have appeared in defence of this position, I shall referre him to reverend Mr. *Gatakers* learned dispute held with reverend Dr. *Ward*, where he may see multitudes voting for it. And when Dr. *Ward*[a] saith, that some Divines do stick at his tenent, and do restrain the effect of Baptisme infallibly taking away the guilt of original sin onely to the effect, Mr. *Gataker* replyes, not alone some, but the greater part of our Divines do not so much stick, or hesitate here, as professedly oppose, which is evidently demonstrated in the testimonies (saith he) before cited, pag. 134. And my reverend friend Mr. *Bedford*, unhappily engaged in this controversy, to carry the Sacraments higher then Scripture hath raised them, misled with the over esteem of some that have gone that way, tells us of his discouragement, by reason of the multitude of those of an opposite opinion, that held otherwise then he did about the Sacraments. And Mr. *Baxter* rightly doth observe, that at *the first broaching of this doctrine among us, it was so much disrelished, not by Dr.* Taylour *onely, but by most Divines, and godly people, as farre as I could learn, that it did succeed, and spread as little, as almost any error that ever I knew spring up in the Church.* Plain Scripture proof of Infants, &c. pag. 294. so inconsiderable was the party that stood for it. And *Vorstius* speaking in the name of Protestant Divines in general, saith,[b] *It is disputed whether Sacraments are onely signes and seales of the Covenant of grace, or outward signes annext the Covenant and appointed for this of God, that they should signify saving grace of God promised in the Covenant, and signifying seal, and after their manner confirm our faith, and give publick testimony of it, which* (saith he) *is the common opinion of Protestants, or whether they be further efficient causes of this saving*

[a] Quod quosdam theologos ait hic hærere, & baptismi effectum hunc ad electos restringere. Imo non quidam dumtaxat, sed multo maxima nostrorum pars, non tam hic hærent, quam ex adverso se diserte opponunt; quod ex testimoniis supra adductis luculentissime demonstratum est.

[b] Id potissimum quæritur, an Sacramenta sint signa tantum & sigilla fœderis gratiæ; sive externa symbola, & signacula, fœderi gratiæ appensa, & divinitus ad hoc instituta, ut gratiam Dei salutarem in fœdere promissam nobis significent; atque ita fidem nostram suo modo confirment, & simul publice testatam reddant: quæ quidem communis est Evangelicorum sententia; an vero præterea sint causæ efficientes hujus salutaris & justificantis gratiæ, sive an sint effectiva gratiæ ejusdem organa, nempe ad hoc divinitus instituta, ut gratiam istam realiter instar vasorum in se contineant, & omnibus illa percipientibus eandem vi sua imprimant, & reipsa conferant, quæ Bellarmini, & Pontificiorum omnium opinio est.

ſaving and juſtifying grace, or whether they be effective inſtruments of this grace appointed of God for this thing, that they ſhould indeed containe it in them, and convey it, which is the opinion of all Papiſts. Vorſtius, Anti. Bellar. ad Contro. 1 Gen. And our men further judge that opinion of the *opus operatum*, or of the outward Sacramental action (as though without the faith, and pious motion of thoſe that uſe it, it could juſtifie any) to be evidently falſe and pernicious: And they teach, that all Sacraments by the ordination of God himſelf have onely a power to ſignifie and ſeal, and not to conferre the grace of the Goſpel it ſelf. And whereas ſeveral paſſages in the *Liturgy* of this Church did ſeem to favour the oppoſite opinion, affixing adoption, membership of Chriſt, and inheritance of the Kingdom of heaven, and regeneration to Baptiſme: we know how great offence it gave to many eminently Learned and pious, putting them upon omiſſion of thoſe paſſages: And alſo what Interpretation, as with a grain of ſalt, others put upon them, that they were onely Sacramentally ſuch. And doubtleſſe theſe either hit upon the meaning of the Church (which was held to theſe phraſes, in imitation of many hyperbolical ſpeeches in the Fathers) or elſe the Church had miſt the meaning of Scriptures; ſo loth were the ſons of the Church to be quarrelling with their mother, and yet more loth with her to run into errors.

The Obſervation it ſelf, if heeded, hath a caution or limit in it; Affirming that Sacraments work no otherwiſe then as ſigns and ſeals; and that they conferre no inward graces or priviledges further then they work upon the underſtanding, and faith of thoſe that receive them: it implyes, that they do conferre what an outward ſymboſe, or ſign is apt to, and of power to convey; and that outward priviledges in Sacraments, are either conferred, or infallibly evidenced. This is clear, the Apoſtle having ſo far undervalued Circumciſion in the fleſh, as to make it Parallell with uncircumciſion, ſo that a circumciſed Jew, and an uncircumciſed Gentile differed nothing as to their Spiritual ſtate and condition; inferres by way of objection, What advantage then hath the Jew, and what profit is there of circumciſion? And anſwers, not that outward circumciſion is altogether unprofitable, but that it hath much profit, and inſtances in one eminent one, *To them are committed the Oracles of God.* This is the *inheritance of the Congregation of Jacob*, Deut. 33. 4. as *Moſes* ſpeaks; and carrying

rying with it this great priviledge, it conveyes with it all other inferiour Church-priviledges; right to the Passeover upon this account was theirs, *Exod.* 12.48. and not otherwise: So it is with Baptisme, men are taken into the Church at this door, according to the Commission given to the Apostles, *Disciple all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, &c.* Whatsoever they were, and whomsoever they professedly served before, they are this way taken in as the consecrate servants of the whole Trinity, and added to the Church, *Act* 2.47. When they had by the Covenant a precedent title, in Baptisme they have a solemn inauguration, *By one Spirit we are all Baptized into one body*, 1 Cor. 12.13. It is the Spirits work to shape the heart of unbelieving *Corinthians*, to enter into one visible Church-body, as that work of Gods power, whereby he did perswade *Japhet* to dwell in the tents of *Shem*, *Gen.* 9.27. And therefore when [c] *Durand* denyed, that the Character which the Church of *Rome* speaks of, was any quality in the soul, but meerly a relation comming as by way of deputation to an office or duty, exemplifying it by the relation that is seen in *Doctors, Prætors, &c*, *Bellar. lib.* 2. *de Sacramen. effectu, cap.* 14. saith, *That this opinion can scarcely be distinguished from the Heresie of this time.* [d] And further saith, *That Heretiques do not deny, nor can deny, but that there is some relation in Ministers, which is not in others, who are not deputed to the Ministery.* We do confesse indeed that there is that relation in Christians to Christ by the work done in the Sacrament of Baptisme, which is not in Heathens. And though we deny Orders to be any Sacrament, yet we confesse there is that relation in Ministers to Christ by vertue of their Ordination, that is not in those that are not called to the work of the Ministery. There are those indeed that do deny it; But those that *Bellarmine* had to deal with, and that he charges for Heretiques, as *Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr, Chemnitius* willingly yeeld it. And in case this were all the character that they talke of to be imprinted in Baptisme; yea, in Ordination, we should never contend about it. And as these priviledges are conferred as to actual interest in the initiatory Sacacraments, both of Baptisme, and Circumcision; so the same priviledges in the following Sacraments are infallibly evidenced. as appears in that text, 1 *Cor.* 10.17. The Apostle there making it his businesse to take off Christians from their resort to the Idols

[c] *Durandus docet characterem esse ens rationis, id est, respectum advenientem ex deputatione ad certum officium, qualis est relatio in Doctoribus, Prætoribus, &c. Quæ sententia vix distinguitur ab hæresi hujus temporis.*

[d] *Hæretici non negant neque negare possunt quin sit aliqua relatio rationis in Ministris, quæ non est in aliis, qui non sunt deputati ad ministrandum.*

Idols temples, to eat there of that which had been offered in ſacrifice, which they judged to be within the verge of their liberty; An Idol being nothing in the world, tells them, that as joyning with Jewes in their ſacrifice offered on the Altar, did declare them to be one body with the Jewes; and eating of the Sacramental bread, did make them one body Chriſtian; ſo alſo going to the Heathens ſacrifices, did evidence them to be one body Heathen. The Apoſtle, as we ſee, *Rom.* 15. thought no underſtanding man would queſtion it, we muſt therefore readily yeeld it; which holds true of the Paſſeover, ſeeing onely the circumciſed who were in faith Jewes, were to be admitted to it, *Exod.* 12. 48. And this I ſuppoſe is that which Reverend *Gataker* means, oppoſing that tenent, that the Sacraments conferre grace by the work done, where there is no barre put, and having quoted teſtimonies of Biſhop *Abbot*, *Calvin*, and *Whitaker*, ſharpely enough declaring themſelves againſt it, adds, *That for the axiome it ſelf I will not contend about it, if that effect of the Sacraments be underſtood, for which they were inſtituted of God, and the Word be taken in a more large ſenſe for all that whatſoever it be that may be any impediment, that the Sacraments cannot have their effect.* Though perhaps in theſe words of his he had ſome other intentions. It were an endleſſe labour to lanch out into the controverſie, and to gather up the various opinions of thoſe of a contrary judgment, and their different thoughts to make good their tenents, whether of thoſe that deny Sacraments to be Seales, as generally the Papiſts, whom Anabaptiſts in this follow at the heels, as in moſt other things both about the Covenant, and Sacraments; Or *Lutherans*, who yeelding them to be ſeales, as well as ſignes, yet affirim that theſe are leſſe principal offices, and uſes of Sacraments: the chief end is to be inſtruments of conveyance of grace to the ſoul; Or diſſenting brethren among Proteſtants, ſome of them falling in with Popiſh Schoolmen, & wholly cloſing with their tenent, that Sacraments conferre grace where no bar is put to hinder their working; or others that hold it with limit onely to Baptiſme, and that to elect children, not daring to put reprobates into a ſtate of regeneration, or remiſſion of ſin, nor yet to aſſert that the elect are alwayes thus regenerate in Baptiſme; But that it holds ſo in ordinary: Or of ſome (that I have met with in diſcourſe) that ſuppoſe that Baptiſme hath his work in thoſe elect infants, where God foreſees that death will prevent

vent their regeneration by the Word: or others that say, that God works by Baptisme to regeneration, and forgivenesse of sin; but according to pleasure, they dare not assign to whom. Some of these I judge to be more evidently opposite to the Scripture then others; yet I confesse, I see not foundation in the Word for any of them. These that are thus agreed, that the Sacraments as instruments conferre grace, without respect had to the receivers faith, yet are at odds among themselves, what manner of instruments they are. He that pleases may read in *Suarez, disput. 9. quæst. 62. art. 4. Sect. 2.* six several opinions about it; *some* will have them to be no efficient, but material causes onely, as a dish conveying a medicine, is no cause of health, but a material instrument onely of conveyance. *Others* hold that they conferre grace *per modum impetrationis*, because the Minister and the Church obtaines of God by prayer grace by them. *Others* say, that they are conditions without which God gives not grace. *Others* yet say, that the Sacraments are causes of grace, because when they are applyed, they move God to conferre it. As we say they work by way of sign on our understanding, so they say they work by way of sign with God, moving him to remember his promise. *Others* say, they conferre grace, because God in a more special manner appears in them as a principal agent, or efficient; which my Authour complaines is very obscure. But he that will consult the Authour of this opinion, which is *Henricum à Gandavo Quod. quart. quæst.* 37. may find much against any power in the Sacraments to conferre, or to speak in his language, to create grace in the soul; creation being solely the prerogative of God, and above the power of any creature to be assistent in it; yet lest he should run upon an heresy against the determination of the Catholick Church, in making them no more then signs and seals, he is put upon it to come off thus blewly, that *Suarez* with all his high wit cannot find out his meaning. *Suarez* himself concludes, that they are Physical instruments in the conveyance of grace, and that they are causes of grace; because by a true Physical action they concur to the sanctification of men. Having with much adoe endeavoured to prove a possibility of their working of grace in a Physicall way, he concludes, that this is their way of working, and that not barely in working some disposition towards grace, not reaching grace it self, nor yet in working an union only of grace with the soul; But in the

most

moſt proper and rigorous ſenſe, Sacraments Phyſically work grace; the very Phyſicall action by which Grace is wrought, and drawn out of the obediential power of the ſoul, truly, really, and Phyſically depending on the Sacraments, which he judges to be moſt agreeable to the dignity of the Sacraments; the phraſes of Scripture, and Councels, and Fathers about them. But it might pitty the Reader to ſee how miſerably he comes off with this aſſertion of his, only telling us, that *the Scripture ſayes, we are cleanſed, ſanctified, or regenerate of water, or the laver of regeneration, and waſhing of water in the Word of life*, without the leaſt light given us, to let us underſtand that theſe phraſes muſt be taken in his Phyſical ſenſe and meaning: adding ſome ſentences of Fathers, who ordinarily give that in their writings to the ſign, which is proper to the thing ſignified, finding yet oppoſite ſentences in them, that much troubles him, in which in an orthodox way, they explain themſelves ſufficiently againſt his poſition. In caſe in this poſition of his of the Phyſicall working of Sacraments, he had only underſtood, that they work according to the nature of the office, and place aſſigned unto them, there might have been juſt cauſe to have ſubſcribed to his judgment. It is of the nature of a ſign to hold forth to us the thing ſignified, of a relative ſymbole, to ingage to the filling up of ſuch a relation. It is of the nature of a ſeal to confirm every grant paſt in Covenant: but to give a Phyſicall power to thoſe elementary ſubſtances to create Grace in, or confer grace upon the ſoul, is a monſtrous tenent. A little Philoſophy will accquaint us with the natural properties of water, and as applyed in waſhing experience will ſoon diſcover it. The Pſalmiſt alſo ſhewes the efficacy which nature gives to bread, and wine, *Pſal* 104. But for either water, bread, or wine to pardon ſin, infuſe habits, or new qualities into the ſoule; or add to the ſtrength of thoſe that are already wrought, is an unheard of ſecret. *Others* yet ſay that they are hyperphyſical, or ſupernatural inſtruments in the conveyance of grace, which might eaſily enough be underſtood, in caſe it could be believed. A power they mean put into them, or exerciſed by them, above that which in their naturall workings they have any poſſible activity to reach, as in the water of the Poole of *Bethesda*, upon the moving of the Angell to heal him that firſt ſtept into it, and in the water of *Jordan* to cleanſe *Naaman* of his Leproſie by ſeven times dipping in it. Had it

had, that naturall power of cure *Abana* and *Pharpar* rivers of *Damascus*, would never have been esteemed equall with it. But that these elements should be standing instruments of the work of miracles of this nature, we had need of full and clear texts of Scripture to make good to us. I shall assoon believe a transubstantiation in the bread from *hoc est corpus meum*, as such a transmutation, or renovation of the soul, or any such priviledges of glory: as Scripture makes the peculiar inheritance of those in whom this change is wrought, upon the bare application of these Elements. Most say they are morall instruments in what they do: but then there is so much work to understand what a morall instrument means, that I dare neither without further expression of my self affirm or deny it. Some make them such instruments by which God works according to pleasure, sometimes working that which they signifie, and sometimes working not at all by them, as sometimes he works by the Word: but sometimes it remains a dead letter. *Others* make it an instrument of conveyance, as a staffe of an Abbotship, a pall of a Bishoprick, a Book of a Canons place, and this doubtlesse is according to the meaning of Scriptures; as men vouchsafing gifts appoint at pleasure Ceremonies, and Solemnities evidencing such donations, so God hath appointed these elements as signs of that nature. Having a precedent right, the initiating Sacrament is a means of solemn inauguration, and the following Sacrament an evidence of continued possession. Baptisme takes into the body, 1 *Cor.* 12.13. and Bread and Wine evidence that we are of the body, 1 *Cor.*10.17. And as a twig, and turfe vests a man in his purchase of lands, a rod vests a customary tenant in his Coppyhold, a Crown vests a King in his Kingdom; so these elements (having this office assigned them of God) vest a man in Covenant in visible Church-membership, and give him actual interest in all visible Church-priviledges. But yet this difference, The *Staffe*, the *Pall*, the *Book*, the *Twig*, and *Turfe*, the *Rod*, the *Crown*, lead no further then to that which they immediately conferre, which is the present dignities, and possessing whereof they are solemnities, and these dignities are also terminated in themselves, and lead men into no expectation of any higher honour. But Sacraments vesting us in Church-priviledges, and these priviledges leading us to higher and greater things as they vest us in present in these, so by way of sign and seal, they lead, and raise

us

us unto all that Church-priviledges serve, and are appointed to advance us unto. So that God works as a Moral agent, in appointing according to pleasure these elements as solemnities of his grant, and they work according to the nature of the office assigned them, that is, by way of sign and seal, for the help of our understandings, the refreshing of our memories, and strength of our faith in promises of greater things.

SECT. II.

Propositions tending to clear the doctrine.

IN order to the discovery of some further light concerning the operation of Sacraments, and for detection of erroneous opinions about them, I shall lay down several Positions.

Explicatory Propositions. 1. Mans first original is in sin.

First, This must be held as an uncontroverted truth between parties in this dispute, that *Mans first original is in sin, his first estate* (not by Creation, but by birth, not as he came out of the hands of God, but as he comes into the world) *is in full opposition against heaven, The imagination of mans heart, is evil from his youth*, Gen. 8.21. The word (as *Ainsworth*, and *Rivet* on the place, with Mr. *Hilderſam* on *Psal.* 51.5. observe) signifies infancy, the same title which is given to *Moses* when he was new-born, *Exod.* 2.6. Compare with this *Psal.* 58.3. *The wicked are estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lyes.* The sin of all begins then, the sin of bad men still remains, no change is wrought in them, nor amendment seen, but a progresse in evil, *Psal.* 51.5. *Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me*; The cavils of old Anabaptists to take off the force of this text are vain, That by iniquity here is not meant sin, but sorrow, which for sin came upon women in childbearing, and that by sin in the later part of the verse is meant the height of lust in *Davids* parents. Let any man look into the context, and see whether it will bear any such glosse. *David* is there upon a serious humiliation of his soul for sin, and aggravating it in the circumstances of it, and how his mothers sharpe throwes in travel, or either of his parents height of lust, can add any thing at all to aggravate his guilt, or increase his sorrow,

none can underſtand, he preſently prayes that this may be cleanſed, and taken away, which can be underſtood of neither of thoſe particulars which are in the objection. This pollution by birth ſin abundantly appears in reaſon.

Arguments evincing it.

1. By the neceſſity of regeneration, or new-birth in all thoſe that enter into the Kingdom of heaven. As the Apoſtle ſaith of Covenants, *If the firſt had been faultleſſe, there had been no need of a ſecond*, Heb. 8.7. ſo we may ſay of births; there is a neceſſity of a ſecond, therefore there was a fault in the firſt; take away this birth-ſin, or original pollution, and then you deſtroy regeneration. If all be as it ſhould be in our former birth, then there needs not any other.

2. By the Lord Chriſts Incarnation, in order to the work of Redemption; taking mans nature, he began as man begins in ſin, even with infancy; he dyed in our nature for all, of all ſorts, conditions, and ages: infants partake of the fruit of his death, and were upon that account admitted as his by Circumciſion, and are in Baptiſme, and are therefore under the defilement of ſin.

3. By the ſtroke or judgement unto which infants are ſubject, being lyable to ſickneſſe, taken away by death, ſubject to miſeries of all kinds; ſin goes before as the cauſe, where theſe follow as effects, *Rom.* 5.12. *As by one man ſin entered into the world, and death by ſin: ſo death paſſed upon all men; for that all have ſinned, or in whom all have ſinned.*

[e] Homines natura ſua eſſe malos & induci non poſſe ut juſtitiam colant.

[f] Hominem à natura noverca in lucem edi corpore nudo, fragili atq; infirmo, animo ad moleſtias anxio, ad timores humili, in quo divinus ignis ſit obrutus. Referunt Theol. Lydenſes, Diſp. 15. Theſ. 6.

4. The readineſſe and proneneſſe of little ones to run upon ſin is an evidence of it. The thornes, bryars, and weeds, that the earth caſts out, when precious flowers, and choiſe plants are more hardly nouriſhed, is an argument that the earth is under a curſe, and is not now, as once it was. The ſins that even in childhood appear, and together with age grow forwards, when graces are difficultly planted, and that which is good very hardly produced, is as great an evidence of a mans innate degeneration. This even Heathens could ſee, though they knew not whence it was. [e] *Plato* obſerved that *men by nature are wicked, and that they cannot be brought to learne righteouſneſſe*; and [f] *Tully* lamented, that *man is brought into the world by his ſtepdame nature, with a body naked, frail, and weak, a mind anxious in troubles, low under fears, weak for labour, prone to luſt, in whom every Divine ſpark is overwhelmed.* If any man demand how it comes to paſſe that we are thus, we muſt look as far as *Adam*, to ſee the inlet

inlet of it, *By one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners*, Rom. 5.19. His was *peccatum originans*, giving the riſe to all evils in us, thence iſſued *peccatum originatum* our original condition as before decribed. Sin ſeizing upon the Angels, made them unclean, and they have through that defilement the denomination of unclean *ſpirits*; ſin ſeizing upon man hath rendered him unclane; It defiled not onely the perſon of man, but the nature of man; had man ſtood, all mankind had ſtood; man falling, all mankind became filthy, *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one*, Job. 14.4. *Adam* begat a ſon *in his own likeneſſe*, Gen. 5. 3. like himſelf, when he had loſt the image of God; what ſin made man, that an infant is, ſo far as of capacity to be, not to act ſin; he that can do nothing, cannot do evil, but in them there are thoſe principles, that ſhew themſelves in action ſo far as there is power to act. A young Serpent doth ſting none, poyſons none, but there is in them a poyſonous and deſtroying na ure, which growes, as nature growes.

5. By the duty imcumbent upon Chriſtians to put off the old man, *Epheſ.* 4.22. which is not ſo called in oppoſition to that which is young, (as though man grew up to it by degrees, many years being gone over his head before he had gotten that name) but in oppoſition to that which is new, as we ſee, ver. 23. The old hath the precedency of the new, and is before it as the old garments are worne, and put off before the new put on; why muſt all of neceſſity be new if the old would ſerve the turn?

Secondly, *This ſin which is mans hereditary eſtate, hath in it not onely a want of that Priwitive purity, which God ſtamped upon man, according to his own likeneſſe, but alſo an univerſal defilement and pollution*: Therefore the Apoſtle ſetting out this eſtate under the name of the *old man*, gives it this character, *corrupt according to deceitfull luſts*, Epheſ. 4.22. All the pollution in the world is from luſt, 2 *Per.* 1 4. that is the ſink, and ſource, from whence all proceeds, and the old man is wholly made up of theſe corrupt, filthy, and defiling principles. They promiſe better when they draw aſide, but that is their work; and therefore as they are corrupt, ſo they are branded as deceitful likewiſe. Upon this account it is, that man is *dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*, able to riſe no higher in nature then that which is ſin; and this renders his converſation to be *according to the courſe of this world, after the prince of the power of the air*; the former is his pattern, and

2. This Original ſtate of man is not onely a want of Priwitive integrity, but is attended with univerſal defilement.

And consequently with guilt or ordination to punishment.

and the later is his Soveraign; the one is followed, the other ſerved. In *fulfilling the deſires*, or wills, *of the fleſh and mind*, Epheſ. 2. 23. *ſerving divers luſts and pleaſures*, Tit. 3. 3. as wholly enſlaved by this defiling principle. And as this is of the being, ſo guilt or ordination to puniſhment is a neceſſary adjunct, or conſequent of it; Death is in as great a latitude as ſin, *Rom.* 5. 12. the proper wages of that work, *Rom.* 6. 23. Therefore all that have a nature thus defiled, *are by nature the children of wrath*, Epheſ. 2. 3. Men may deſcant as they will upon the word, and tell us of another uſe of it in prophane Authors; but all their wit will not work men from under this guilt, or gain him any thing more in his birth-ſtate, but wrath for his portion.

3. Nature muſt be healed and guilt removed, for reſtitution of man to his Primitive glory.

Thirdly, *To reſtore man to his Primitive happineſs, his nature muſt be healed, and his guilt removed; there muſt be a change wrought in his principles, and a pardon vouchſafed of his ſin.* If either the ſtain continue, or the guilt hold, man will be wretched; till he be again like God, and reconciled to God, his caſe is forlorne: This needs no proof, man was without ſtain or guilt when God made him upright, his ſtain muſt be waſhed, and guilt removed, or elſe his happineſſe is not repaired. And this was the converted *Corinthians* glory; they were under the defilement of Adultery, Idolatry, Fornication, Drunkenneſſe, &c. and upon this account. under the ſad doome of excluſion out of the Kingdom of heaven; but being waſhed, ſanctified, juſtified, the doome is reverſed. However you Interpret theſe ſeveral phraſes, we have their deliverance from the ſtain and guilt of ſin in them.

4. Either of both of theſe is the work of Chriſt by his blood and Spirit.

Fourthly, *Either of both of theſe is the work of Chriſt, and the happy priviledge of all of Goſpel-intereſt.* He takes off the ſtain in the work of Regeneration, and Sanctification by the power of his Spirit; as by our fall we were dead in ſin, ſo by this new work on our hearts, we are dead to ſin; we were free from righteouſneſſe, now we are alive to righteouſneſſe, *Rom.* 8. 11. *If the Spirit of him that raiſed up Jeſus from the dead, dwell in you, he that raiſed up Chriſt from the dead, ſhall alſo quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. When we were dead in ſins, he hath quickened us together with Chriſt*, Epheſ. 2. 5. *Chriſt loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it, that he might Sanctifie, and cleanſe it with the waſhing of water by the Word, that he might preſent it to himſelf a glorious Church, not having ſpot or wrinkle*

or

or any ſuch thing, but that it ſhould be holy, & without blemiſh, Ephe. 5. 25,26,27. As the ſpot is taken off by his Spirit in working new principles in us, and working us up to new obedience: ſo the guilt is removed by his ſufferings; He *blots out their tranſgreſſions for his Names ſake*, He *remembers them no more*, He *hides his face* from them, He *caſts them into the bottom of the ſea, removes them as far as the Eaſt is from the Weſt*; He doth not one of theſe, to leave the other undone; He vouchſafes purifying, and he vouchſafes pacifying grace. He *delivers from the wrath to come*, and he makes *meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light*; He conferres habitual graces, and he honours with relative priviledges.

5. Blood and Spirit may be diſtinguiſhed, but muſt not be divided.

Fifthly, *Theſe may be diſtinguiſhed, but they muſt by no means be divided; Chriſt doth not impart his merit, where he doth deny his Spirit.* We account it a great preſumption in men of years, to talke of juſtification, and want ſanctification; and we can ſay to ſuch, *If any man have not the Spirit of Chriſt, he is none of his.* God writes his Law in the heart, and puts it into the inward parts, where he remembers ſin no more, *Jer.* 31.33. They are quickened together with Chriſt, that have their treſpaſſes forgiven them, *Col.* 2.13. And it is an unwarrantable conceit to imagine that relative priviledges of adoption, and pardon of ſin, are conferred on infants in Baptiſme, or otherwiſe, when their natures remain ſtill the ſame and unchanged; who can think that God fits all of age for glory, that he takes into glory? and yet takes infants into glory, their impurity and birth-defilement continuing. Seeing that we have inſtances, as of Gods love of infants, *Rom.* 9.13. of Chriſts bleſſing of them, *Matth.* 19.16. ſo alſo of the gift of his Spirit, *Jer.* 1.5. *Luk.* 1.15. In caſe the former may be avoided, yet certainly the later is above exception. The reaſon given by Chriſt of that ſentence of his, holding forth an abſolute neceſſity of regeneration, *Except a man be born again, he cannot ſee the Kingdom of God*; is the pollution of the firſt birth, as appears by his own words, ver. 6. inferred immediately upon the repetition of the former, *That which is born of the fleſh, is fleſh*; and this is of equal concernment to infants and men of years; uncleanneſſe of birth, as well as uncleanneſſe of life, ſtands as a barre to our entrance into heaven; and no unclean perſon muſt enter there.

6.

Sixthly, *The Sacraments, eſpecially thoſe of initiation (whether*

The Sacraments especially those of initiation have respect to both of these.

ther in the old or new Covenant) about which concerning this in question there is most dispute, have respect to this whole work, both of the change of our nature, and the removal of our guilt: As they have respect to the one, so also to the other; and that the whole of their work, and the way how it is wrought may be better understood, we are to consider that; First, *Somewhat* is hinted, and implyed in those respective signs of Circumcision and Baptisme, and that is our uncleanneſſe in nature, and guilt contracted upon it. Why should either infant, or man of years have the foreskin of his flesh in that way by Divine appointment cut off; but to let us understand the propagation of corruption, and derivation of it from man to posterity? Why should water be applyed, which is of an absterſive, cleansing faculty, but to let us know that there is uncleanneſſe to be removed? Cleansing of that which is clean is vain, and needleſſe. As Sacrifices for atonement did imply wrath, so this cleansing implyes filth, and consequently guilt, filth and guilt being inseparable.

Secondly, Somewhat is signified and taught us in them; somewhat the bare signs themselves are apt to signifie, *viz.* That the taking off of the staine, and the removal of our guilt, is to be done by anothers power. Why is this applyed by another hand, but to let us know that it is above our strength? *Somewhat*, not the signes of themselves, but the Word of the Covenant that is annext teaches, and that is, That the blood of Christ removes this guilt, and that the Spirit of Christ takes away this stain. This the signes of themselves could never shew, but the words of the Covenant abundantly do demonstrate, that remission of guilt, is the work of the blood of Christ, and Regeneration or Sanctification, the work of the Spirit. That the water in Baptisme holds out the Spirit unto us for Sanctification, and change of our wayes, is (that I know) denyed by none, and in the Scripture it is plain, *I will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed*, Deut. 30.6. *Circumcision is that of the heart*, Rom. 2.29. which by the Apostle, *Col.* 2.11. is interpreted the *putting off the body of the sins of the flesh:* Baptisme is the same as to the signification, as we see in the same place, from the Apostle, *Col.* 2.11,12,13. *In whom ye are also circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in Baptisme, wherein ye are also risen with him through the faith of the*

operation

operation of God, who hath raiſed him from the dead, and you being dead in your ſins, and the uncircumciſion of your fleſh hath he quickned together with him, having forgiven all your treſpaſſes. And this death to ſin, and life in grace are both from the Spirit, *Rom.*8. 11,12,13. and both of theſe Baptiſme holds out to us, *Rom.*6.4. *We are buried with him by Baptiſme into his death, that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead, by the glory of the Father: even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſſe of life.* But whether the blood of Chriſt be at all ſignified by this element of water ſome have queſtioned. Sticking ſo rigidly to that phraſe of the Apoſtle, *Tit.*3.5. that they will not alone have it underſtood of Baptiſme, but they will have nothing elſe looked after in Baptiſme, but the work of regeneration: But this doubtleſſe is a clear miſtake. The blood that was ſhed in circumciſion, gave the circumciſed to underſtand, that the guilt propagated, could not without blood be remitted. And if any think that this is too dark, and obſcure a proof of a Myſtery of this weight, let them compare with it the text under hand, and the Apoſtles ſcope and aime in it, which (as we have heard) is to ſhew, that *Abrahams* circumciſion was not his juſtification; ſeeing he was juſtified by faith in his ſtate of uncircumciſion, and that he received circumciſion as a ſign and ſeal of it; juſtification is by blood, *Rom.*3.25. *Circumciſion is a ſign, and ſeal of juſtification.* Righteouſneſſe of faith is not Sanctification, Sanctification is inherent, the righteouſneſſe of faith is imputed; but circumciſion is a ſign, and ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith. And that Baptiſme ſignifies, and ſeals the ſame thing we find expreſſely in *Peters* words, *Act.*2.38. *Be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins.* Remiſſion of ſins is by blood, *Heb.*9.22. *Without ſhedding of blood there is no remiſſion.* Baptiſme is for remiſſion of ſins; and therefore the water in Baptiſme holds out the blood of Chriſt. And I doubt not, but *Ananias* had reſpect to this in his ſpeech to *Paul*, *Act.*22.16. *Riſe, and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins.* *Somewhat* it is, to which theſe ſigns engage, and that is all, unto which a Chriſtian in duty, as duty, ſtands engaged, whether for his change in heart or life, or in order to the pardon of his ſin. Baptiſme engages to the firſt work of regeneration, and to the firſt work of making all new within: To this circumciſion did tye; as it ſignified it, ſo it engaged to it, *Deut.* 10.16. *Circumciſe the foreskin of your hearts, and be no more* ſtiffe-

ſtiffenecked. If by vertue of their circumciſion in the fleſh, God did not require it, why is the want of it charged on *Judah* as their ſin? or how could it lay them open with other Nations to puniſhment? *Jer.*9.25,26. *Behold, the dayes come, ſaith the Lord, that I will puniſh all them that are circumciſed, with the uncircumciſed,* Egypt, *and* Judah *and* Edom, *and the children of* Ammon, *and* Moab, *and all that are in the uttermoſt corners, that dwell in the wilderneſſe: for all theſe Nations are uncircumciſed, and all the houſe of* Iſrael *are uncicumciſed in the heart.* And that the firſt work is required, as well as a further degree and progreſſe, both in circumciſion and baptiſme is clear: In baptiſme we are explicitly dedicated (as the Jewes were implicitly in circumciſion) to Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt; and therefore engaged to be ſincerely his in Covenant. But this cannot be, till a change be wrought, and we be born again from above. To this therefore we are engaged. Weare engaged to *love the Lord with all our heart, with all our ſtrength*; but this cannot be, while our hearts are in an unchanged condition, and therefore the circumciſion of the heart, *Deut.*30.6. is mentioned in order to this of the love of the Lord: *The Lord thy God will circumciſe thine heart, and the heart of thy ſeed, to love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy ſoul*; what is it but the firſt work that is called for in that of the Prophet? *Make ye a new heart, and a new ſpirit,* Ezek.10.31. And in thoſe texts of the Apoſtle, *Awake thou that ſleepeſt and ſtand up from the dead,* Epheſ.5.14. *Be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds,* Rom.12.2. *That ye put off concerning the former converſation, the old man*—And *be renewed in the ſpirit of your minds,* Epheſ.4.22,23. Howſoever ſome of theſe Scriptures may be conceived to be directed to men in a ſtate of Regeneration, and therefore that they call not for the firſt work, but for a further progreſſe in grace, yet all of them cannot be ſo Interpreted. And there is not any of them but implyes, that where the firſt work is not done, it muſt be done; where the old man is not put off, it muſt be put off; and where the new man is not put on, it muſt be put on; where the ſpirit is not renewed, it muſt be renewed. Neither is it of force againſt this, to ſay, that the firſt work is out of our power, and that in it we are wholly paſſive, and therefore we do not in baptiſme engage to it, but God rather engages for it. To which I anſwer, Though it be out of our power, yet it is

within

within the command of God, and is matter of our duty. Gods command is no rule of our strength, neither is it brought down to answer our weakneſſe; ſo a carnall man ſhould be under no ſpiritual command, but it is a rule of our duty; what we once were, and ſtill ought to be, it commands us for to be. And though we be paſſive in the firſt work, yet we are alwaies concerned to be active, and aſſoon as we do receive power, we are to act. Dead *Lazarus* was commanded to riſe, and having power communicated from God, he did actually riſe and come out of the grave. There is not any promiſe of God for inherent Grace, nor any work of Grace, but it comes within our duty, and a command lies on us; as inſtance might be given, and conſequently there is an obligation and engagement to it. Gods command and his promiſes ſtand not in oppoſition, but in ſubordination; and to ſay that God is engaged, and not man, is dangerous; then all that are baptized muſt be regenerate, or elſe God fails in his engagement. Somewhat it is, that theſe ſigns ſeal, and in ſealing ratify, and confirm, and that is (as the text ſhewes) the righteouſneſſe of Faith, and conſequently all other priviledges whatſoever of like nature, that are annexed to it; Remiſſion, Juſtification, Adoption, Glorification. Sacraments, as ſeals, have not (as I conceive) at leaſt immediately, and directly reference to graces, or inherent habits; but priviledges. They are (as Mr. *Baxter* hath well obſerved) ſeales of the conditional Covenant, and ſo they muſt ſeal, whatſoever they do ſeal, on Gods terms and conditions: they ratifie mercies promiſed, on thoſe termes that the Covenant doth promiſe; now graces are the conditions, and termes of the Covenant, and mercies are promiſed upon thoſe termes: and therefore the Covenant requires them, but the Sacraments do not ratifie and ſeal them. The Sacraments as ſigns ſhew us our wants of, or wants in grace by the help of the Word, and light received from it: they point us out where ſupply may be found, they engage us to this change, to the whole of duty required from the people of God: and upon anſwer of our conſcience in this work, they ſeal, and confirm all promiſed priviledges to us. The nature, efficacy, and operation of Sacraments would be better underſtood, if that which is proper to each part, or the particular office in each relation, were better known. The ſeal in a Leaſe, as from the Leſſor, doth not ratifie the homage, that is to be done by the

Leſſee, or the ſervice from him due; but the inheritance, or benefit whatſoever, which upon condition of ſuch homage, or ſervice is conveyed. Graces are the homage, and priviledges are the benefit, or the inheritance; the priviledges then, and not the graces, are directly in Sacraments ſealed to us. It is not ſealed up to us; either in Baptiſme or the Lords Supper, that we do believe or repent; but that believing, and repenting, we have forgiveneſſe of ſin, and ſalvation. But ſome ſay, that the Sacraments ſeal all that the Covenant promiſes; but the Covenant promiſes Grace, and therefore the Sacraments ſeal, and confirm in this, that we have grace. Anſw. Not to diſpute the abſolute Covenant in this place, as many call it; The Covenant to which Sacraments are annext as ſeales, properly promiſes priviledges upon condition of graces, and requires the graces though God in his elect ever graciouſly works; what it is reſpective to grace that Sacraments do, we have now heard, that is, to ſhew us our want of it, and point us out the fountain of it, engaging us to it, and upon our making good our engagements through Grace, they ratify theſe promiſed priviledges to us.

7. Scriptures of two ſorts are brought by thoſe that would advance Sacraments above that which they work as ſigns and ſeales.

Seventhly, *The texts of Scripture brought by thoſe that would raiſe the work of Sacraments above all that they do, as ſignes, and ſeales; and to evince that they have an abſolute work on the ſoul, without reſpect had, either to the underſtanding, or faith of the receivers, are of two ſorts. The firſt are ſuch, where no Sacrament at all is mentioned, neither can it by any good argument be proved, that Sacraments in thoſe texts, are directly intended. Others are ſuch wherein Baptiſme indeed is mentioned; but faith is evidently required to the attainment of the effect there ſpecified*; when theſe two are proved, a full anſwer is given to all the Scriptures which by the Adverſaries in this behalf are objected. Scriptures of the firſt rank are, *Titus* 3. 5. *According to his mercy he ſaved us, by the waſhing of Regeneration*, Epheſ. 5. 25, 26. *Chriſt loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it, that he might ſanctifie and cleanſe it, with the waſhing of water by the word*, 1. Cor. 6. 12. *Such were ſome of you; but ye are waſhed, but ye are ſanctified, but ye are juſtified in the Name of the Lord Jeſus.* Though the thing ſignified in Baptiſme is here evidently ſpoken to, and ſome alluſion may be conceived to be here made to Baptiſme; yet I ſuppoſe that it can by no good argument be proved, that the Sacrament of Baptiſme in any of theſe Scriptures is intended.

1. Such wherein no Sacrament is mentioned, nor can be proved that any is intended.

First,

Arguments evincing that Baptiſme is not intended in the Saccamental work of it.

Firſt, The Lords Supper may be as fairely evidenced out of Chriſt words, *Joh.* 6. 53, 54, 55. *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you; whoſo eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raiſe him up at the laſt day; for my fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed*, as Baptiſme may be evinced out of any of thoſe texts alleadged: when yet Proteſtant Writers unanimonſly conclude, and ſeverall learned Papiſts yield, that no Sacramentall eating is there intended. To clear this they ſay, there is a meer Sacramentall eating, and drinking the fleſh and blood of Chriſt, when the outward ſigns are received, and no more; a meer ſpirituall eating and drinking, when Chriſt is applyed by faith without any Sacramentall ſign; and an eating, and drinking both Sacramental and Spirituall, when the Sacrament is received by ſincere believers; and the text in *John* is underſtood (as they conclude) of bare ſpiritual eating, and drinking. The ſame we may apply to waſhing, and conclude, that it is meerly ſpiritual waſhing, that in theſe texts alleadged is underſtood. Secondly, There are the ſame phraſes, or thoſe that are parallell with them, in Old Teſtament-Scriptures, when no Sacrament of this kind was inſtituted, and therefore could not be intended, *Pſal.* 51. 7. *Purge me with Hyſſope, and I ſhall be clean: waſh me, and I ſhall be whiter then Snow*, Ezek. 36. 25 *Then will I ſprinckle cleane water upon you, and you ſhall be clean from all your filthineſſe.* And it muſt needs be that meer Spiritual, and not Sacramentall waſhing, for the reaſon alleadged, muſt in theſe texts be underſtood. Thirdly, If outward Baptiſme were there intended, why ſhould not the word Baptiſme be there, as in other places uſed? when we ſee it is yet omitted, when other words are in the ſtead of it induſtriouſly choſen; when common waſhing is intended, we know that the word Baptiſme is frequently uſed, as *Mar.* 7. 8. *Luk.* 11. 38. and ſo alſo, when legall cleanſing is ſpoken to; as, *Heb.* 9. 20. And in caſe Baptiſme it ſelf were here purpoſely intended, it is marvel that other words ſhould by the Spirit of God be choſe, and this laid aſide. Fourthly, This Interpreters of eminent note have ſeen. Mr. *Gataker*, diſceptatio de Baptiſ. Infant. vi & efficacia, pag 51. ſaith, *It* § *may juſtly be doubted, whether the Sacrament of Baptiſme, or inward waſhing in that*

§ Dubitari poteſt non immerito, baptiſmine Sacramentum, an interna ablatio, hoc nomine eo loci deſignetur.

place

place of Titus 3.5. be understood; & then adds, [h] *Though, I am not be that will deny that some respect is had in those words to the outward rite of Baptisme, yet I believe that they are expressely spoken of the inward washing, and that the words may be interpreted by the clause immediately following, the renewing by the Holy Ghost*; quoting *Piscator* for his opinion, Thes. theol. vol. 1. loc. 25. Sect. 20. who saith, *By the laver of regeneration the Apostle seems not to intend baptisme, but regeneration it self, which he compares to a laver*: and also Dr. *Slater* on *Rom.* 2.25. affirming, That it is doubtful, whether in *Titus* 3.5. there be any speech of the Sacrament, or onely of the blood of Christ, and of the Spirit; and in his words (as the Reader that pleases to consult him may see) he takes in *Ephes.* 5.26. likewise *Vorstius* speaks most fully of all to these Texts, mentioning the Argument drawn from *Ephes.* 5. *Titus* 3. for the *opus operatum* in Sacraments, he sayes, Our Divines answer, [i] *That impertinent testimonies are urged, which hold forth the thing signified in Sacraments, by way of metaphor, but do not speak of Sacraments properly so called*, Antibel. Tom. 3. Contro. 1. Thes. 1. & 2. And whereas *Calvin* is produced by some, as interpreting *Titus* 3. 5. of outward baptisme, his authority will but little help them. [k] *I do not doubt* (saith he) *but that the Apostle doth at least allude to baptisme*; and further saith, *I can easily bear, that this place should be interpreted of baptisme*; on which words of his, Mr. *Gataker*, pag. 123. very well comments. [l] *As though he would rather* (saith he) *allow another interpretation, if the importunity of others did not lead him that way. They are words of one granting, or rather yielding somewhat to another man, then speaking his own mind*, as he further observes. And Mr. *Burges*, Spiritual Refining, Part 1 pag. 214. speaking of Baptisme, saith, it is called the *laver of regeneration*, Titus 3.5. as some expound it, giving us to understand, that it is no exposition universally agreed upon, and sufficiently hinting, that it is the more inconsiderable part that do interpret it this way. Fifthly, Though we should yield that these places were to be understood of the Sacrament of Baptisme, as *Calvin* saith

[h] Atque ego certe, etiamsi ad baptismi ritum externum respectum aliquem haberi nullus negaverim, de interna tamen ablutione, diserte dictum existimo, quæ externa illa lotione corporis designatur, ut ex clausula mox sequente verba illa exponantur, per lavacrum regenerationis non videtur apostolus significare baptismum, sed ipsam regenerationem quam lavacro comparat.

[i] Aliena testimonia citari, viz. quæ res quidem in Sacramentis significatas metaphorice declarant, attamen de Sacramentis proprie dictis non agunt.

[k] Non dubito quin saltem ad baptismum alludat, imo facile patior de baptismo locum exponi.

[l] Quasi aliam potius quorundam expositionem probaturus, ni aliorum importunitas alio impelleret. Verba sunt enim alii concedentis aliquid, potius quam animi sui sensum enuntiantis.

ſaith he could be content to do, yet all this while nothing is gained, ſeeing it ſtill reſts to be proved, that this is meant any otherwiſe then by way of ſign and ſeal, they conclude no abolute work, but onely as they have their influence upon the underſtanding, and faith of the receivers. And therefore *Calvin*, when he was prevailed withall to yield ſo farre, as we have heard, preſently addes, [m] *Not that ſalvation is included in the outward ſymbole of water, but becauſe Baptiſme ſeales it to us, when Chriſt hath obtained it for us.* And *Danæus* ſpeaking to that Argument of *Bellarmine*, that the Scripture witneſſeth, that the words of the Sacrament are active inſtruments of our juſtification, and not ſeales of the promiſe, giving inſtance in theſe, and the like Scriptures for this purpoſe, anſwers: [n] *Inſtruments, and ſigns meerly teſtifying, and ſealing are ſaid by a trope, and metonymy to do that which they ſeal; for even a ring uſed in eſponſals, which onely is a ſign, is ſaid to joyn and bind the eſpouſed; an inſtrument of contract, which is onely a token of agreement, is ſaid to bind the contractors; and the letters and ſeal of a Doctor to create a Doctor: for thoſe things that are helpful to us, are ſaid to effect thoſe things, as to ſuch an end, in which they are helpful. But the homonymy of words of this nature is to be ſhunned, which attributes actions to ſignes, or inſtruments, as to cauſes, leſt upon that account, we may think that ſuch ſignes or inſtruments are cauſes of ſuch actions, or efficients of ſuch fruits, and effects. For they effect or are ſaid to do ſuch a work alone after their manner, that is, onely by way of ſign, as they ſeal or certify ſuch an act, or work, or by way of inſtrument, becauſe they are uſed in the work. For ſignes and inſtruments properly ſo called do very much differ; For ſignes contribute nothing to the work, of which ſort are Sacraments, but onely truely and certainly teſtifie, and ſeal the work of the Spirit of God wrought.* *Danæus Contra Bellarmi.* Tom. *Contro.* 2. *cap.*

[m] Non quod in externo aquæ ſymbolo incluſa ſit ſalus, ſed quia partam a Chriſto ſalutem Baptiſmus nobis obſignat.

[n] Inſtrumenta & ſigna etiam mere obſignantia & teſtantia dicuntur, per tropum & metonymiam id facere quod obſignant, nam & annulus ſponſalium qui ſolus eſt ſignum eorum, dicitur conjungere & obligare ſponſos, contractus inſtrumentum quod ſolum conſenſus ſignum obſtringere contrahentes, Doctoratus ſigillum & literæ creaſſe & effeciſſe in Doctorem; quæ enim nos juvant efficere ea ipſa dicuntur, propter finem in quem ſpectant, in quibus ab eis juvamur. Verum vitanda eſt verborum hujuſmodi, quæ ut cauſis vel ſignis vel inſtrumentis actionem tribuunt homonymia: ne propterea cenſeamus ea ſigna vel inſtrumenta eſſe cauſas iſtius actionis, vel effecti, vel fructus efficientes; efficiunt enim aut efficere dicuntur illa effecta, ſuo tantum modo, nempe per modum duntaxat ſigni, quatenus obſignant & certificant eam actionem vel effectionem, aut per modum inſtrumenti, quoniam ad effectionem adhibentur: multum enim ſigna, & vera inſtrumenta inter ſe proprie differunt, ſigna vero nihil plane ad effectionem conferunt, qualia ſunt Sacramenta, ſed affectionem Sp. S. & opus illius in nobis duntaxat veriſſime & certiſſime teſtantur & conſignant.

Cap. 14. *ad Arg.* 2. Abundance more might be added, to clear theſe Texts, and take them out of their hands, that urge them for this purpoſe, though they were meant of the Sacraments, which is not to be granted. And what we have ſaid of theſe Texts, may be affirmed of that alſo, *Deut.* 30. 6. *I will circumciſe thy heart, and the heart of thy ſeed:* Circumciſion which was a Sacrament, is indeed there named, but the ſpeech is onely borrowed by way of metaphor, from the circumciſion of the fleſh, and applyed to the heart, as is clear, *Deut.* 10. 16. where that work is given in command to the *Jewes*, and they were not commanded to circumciſe themſelves, but were already in Circumſion.

A ſecond ſort of Scriptures are ſuch in which baptiſme is mentioned, but faith evidently required to the attainment of the effects of it.

A ſecond ſort of Scriptures are ſuch where Baptiſme is indeed mentioned, and the Sacrament of Baptiſme intended, but faith is evidently required for the attainment of the effect ſpecified. Theſe eſpecially are, *Acts* 2. 38. *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins,* Acts 22. 16. *Riſe and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the Name of the Lord.* I ſhall referre the Reader for a full vindication of theſe Scriptures to Mr. *Gatakers* diſceptation, pag. 9, 10, &c. pag. 56, 57. and ſhall onely adde, that that phraſe, *in the Name of the Lord*, utterly deſtroies all that they would build on theſe words, ſeeing it implies faith in his Name, as, *Acts* 3. 16. may be ſeen; And howſoever Infants that are in Covenant upon their parents profeſſion of faith, are baptized into this Name, yet thoſe of yeares (as theſe were, to whom this ſpeech is directed) are in their own perſons, not onely to make profeſſion of faith, but in ſincerity to believe, in order to attainment to the pardon of their ſins, or any other ſpiritual priviledge of the Covenant whatſoever. Yea, that which theſe men would draw from theſe Texts ſtands not with their principles that urge them. The Sacraments work grace, ſay they, as inſtruments; I ſhall then deſire to know whether poſitive infidelity be not ſuch a barre that will hinder? If it be a barre in men of yeares, then the Sacrament works not without actual faith in the baptized: It is the priviledge of faith to obtain forgiveneſſe of ſin, *Act.* 13. 39. *Rom.* 3. 25. It is the work then of faith in the baptized to obtain it, and baptiſme to them (as Circumciſion to *Abraham*) is onely a ſign and ſeal of it, and doth not otherwiſe effect it. The like I may ſay of impenitence, that according to them, it is a barre

barre to the working of Sacraments. Sacraments onely work in penitent perſons, repentance then is a qualification in them that obtain a pardon, and Sacraments by way of ſeal aſſure penitent ones of it.

Eighthly, *The moſt eminent that ever have appeared for this power in Sacraments to confer grace on the receivers, either utterly deny, or at leaſt very doubtfully affirm, that Baptiſme works in Infants any real change, but onely that which is relative, that it conferres any habits, or any thing more then priviledges on Infants baptized, when yet the Scriptures that they bring for proof of this baptiſmal work, almoſt all ſpeak to ſuch a change, that is reall, not relative; of habits, and not of priviledges.* When this is made good, it will appear to any impartial eye, that the Scripture-Texts alledged come far ſhort of proof of any ſuch baptiſmal power to confer grace on all baptized Infants. This as it ſeems Reverend Dr. *Ward* ſuſpected, aſſerting the certainty of ſalvation of all baptized Infants, dying in infancy, he ſaith, That [o] *it is the undoubted opinion of all antiquity of our Church, and as he thinks of the Scripture it ſelf.* For the former part of this aſſertion, that the moſt eminent, that have appeared on this party, have held, as before, let Reverend B. *Davenant* in his Epiſtle ſpeak; Aſſerting by Arguments that which he ſayes he had often affirmed, that the argument borrowed from Infants, which Arminians, Papiſts, and ſome of our own uſe to maintain the apoſtaſie of Saints, or believers, is not onely invalid, but altogether impertinent, as to that controverſie. His third Propoſition, to make good this aſſertion, is, [p] *That Papiſts do not receive it for a point of faith, that the habits of faith, or charity are infuſed into Infants in Baptiſme, neither do they deliver it, as of faith, that any are thereby made formally juſt, by any inherent habituall righteouſneſſe or holineſſe.* To make this good, *Bonaventure, Aquinas, Gerſon* among the more ancient Schoolmen are brought in, and of the more modern Writers *Soto*, affirming, that habits infuſed into Infants are not ſo known, as is the Catholique faith, and that *Eſtius* doth ingenuouſly acknowledge, that this infuſion of inherent righteouſneſſe is problematically diſputed, the Maſter of the ſentences inclining to the negative. And whereas ſome later Papiſts affirm, that this opinion of infuſed habits in Infants, is now otherwiſe ratified then heretofore by the authority of the *Trent Councel*, he firſt anſwers, that that Councel hath no

8. The moſt eminent of the adverſe opinion produce Scriptures clearly oppoſite to their aſſertions.

[o] Quæ eſt noſtræ Eccleſiæ & totius antiquitatis indubitata ſententia; & ut ego reor, ipſius Scripturæ.

[p] Pontificii non agnoſcunt pro fidei dogmate, habitus fidei aut charitatis, infundi parvulis in baptiſmo, neque tanquam de fide docent, effici ullos juſtos formaliter, inhæſione habitualis juſtitiæ aut Sanctitatis

such authority as to make that an article of faith, which for so many hundred years hath not been such, and afterwards peremptorily denyes, that that Councel did ever so determine, concluding, that it is resolved upon by Papists, that all baptized Infants are some way rendred acceptable to God; but that this is done by any such infused habits, or by any inherent quality created of God, is (as he sayes) as yet doubted among them.

His fourth Proposition is, that [q] *Protestants do not yield, that justifying faith, or charity, that unites us to God: or regenerating grace, that repaires all the faculties of the soul, is infused into Infants in the very moment of Baptisme*; quoting *Calvin*, *Beza*, and *Peter Martyr*, speaking fully to it. [r] *Adding, that he does not know, that any of our Divines determine, that that regeneration which consists in the creation of spirituall qualities (which we call Sanctification, and Papists, formal Justification) is infused in the instant of Baptisme.* And he brings in also *Mountague* in his appeal vouching it out of the *Belgick* and *French* Confessions, and then concludes, when neither *Arminians*, *Papists*, nor *Protestants* acknowledge that Infants in their participation of Baptisme, are made partakers of those habitual gifts and spiritual qualities, which properly make a man just, and inherently holy, none of them can demonstrate the losse of Faith or righteousnesse, or Apostasie of the Saints, by an argument drawn from Infants.

His fifth Proposition is, That [s] *the Fathers do not acknowledge, that either actual or habituall Faith, or charity is given to Infants in Baptisme*; and that they teach, that *conversion or creation of a new heart, which is properly regeneration, is not wrought in them but onely when they come to yeares, and are capable of reason.* For this *Austin* is quoted, and frequent places out of him are produced; and with him *Hierome*, *Nazianzen*, *Justin Martyr*,

[q] Protestantes non concedunt fidem justificantem aut charitatem Deo unientem, aut gratiam regeneratricem, quæ reparat omnes animæ facultates in ipso Baptismi momento infundi infantibus.

[r] Nec quenquam scio ex nostris Theologis qui regenerationem illam quæ sita est in spiritualium qualitatum creatione (quam nos sanctificationem, Pontificii formalem justificationem indigitant) in ipso momento Baptismi productam dicuntur. Cumigitur nec Arminiani nec Pontificii nec Protestantes agnoscant parvulos in ipsa Baptismi susceptione fieri participes illorum habitualium donorum aut Spiritualium qualitatum quæ proprie dicuntur constituere hominem justum et inhærenter sanctum, nemo eorum potest amissionem fidei aut justitiæ aut sanctorum Apostasiam argumento ab infantibus sumpto demonstrare.

[s] Patres nec actualem nec habitualem fidem aut charitatem parvulis in baptismo donatam agnoscunt: conversionem etiam sive novi cordis creationem, quæ proprie regeneratio dicenda est, non nisi cum ad ætatem rationis capacem pervenerint, in iis produci docent.

Martyr, and *Bernard*, making all up with the teſtimony of *Whitaker*, [t] *that the Fathers did not ſo much as dream of the habitual faith which Papiſts ſay is infuſed, by the work done in Baptiſme*, inferring this, as the reſult of all that in five ſeveral propoſitions he had delivered; that [u] (*from thence any man may ſee*) *how invalid this argument is, Many baptized Infants afterwards periſh through unbelief, and impenitence; Therefore faith, charity and other Spiritual qualities, wrought by the Spirit in the regenerate, are ſometimes loſt.* And having delivered himſelf thus in the negative, that Baptiſme works not theſe graces or habits in infants; His firſt propoſition, in the affirmative, tending to ſhew what Baptiſme does work, is, [w] *That all baptized infants are acquitted from the guilt of original ſin*; for which opinion, many Fathers, and Schoolmen are quoted by him, as they were for the former. So that I think the firſt part of my poſition is fully made good, that the moſt eminent that ever have appeared for this power of Sacraments to conferre grace on the receivers, either utterly deny, or elſe doubtfully hold that Baptiſme works any real change in infants, but onely that which is relative, and that it conferres, not habits, but onely priviledges on Infants baptized.

[t] Patres ne ſomniaſſe quidem de habituali Papiſtarum fide, quam illi volunt in Baptiſmo ex opere operato infuſam eſſe parvulis.

[u] Hinc quivis perſpiciat quam invalida ſit hæc concludendi ratio, Multi ex infantibus baptizatis poſtea pereunt in infidelitate et impœnitentia; Ergo fides, charitas, reli quæq; Spirituales qualitates in renatis Spiritus virtute produ-ctæ aliquando amittuntur.

[w] Omnes infantes baptizati ab Originalis peccati reatu abſolvuntur.

For the other part of the poſition, that the Scriptures which theſe bring for proof of this power of Baptiſme, almoſt all ſpeak of ſuch a change, that is real, not relative; of habits, and not of priviledges. The proof is eaſy. What thoſe Scriptures are which by them are produced in this Controverſy, may be ſeen in the former poſition, and that almoſt all of them ſpeak of a real change, not barely that which is relative, is evident. The alone Old Teſtament text that I can find, is, *Deut.* 30. 6. with *Jer.* 9. 25. where circumciſion of the heart is mentioned; which texts as they can hardly be interpreted to ſpeak at all of the Sacrament of Circumciſion, in the outward rite, ſo it is certain, that a real change is ſpoken to by *Moſes* in *Deuteronomy*, and by the Prophet alſo complained of to be wanting. Reverend Dr. *Ward* yields that Spiritual Circumciſion of the heart is there meant; but he ſaith, that by this Spiritual Circumciſion, the re-

miſſion of original guilt, is underſtood. To which[x] Mr. *Gataker* replies, that *he ſees nothing that can perſwade, much leſſe force him to believe any ſuch thing*, Adding; that, *If any ſhould expound*, Deut. 10. 16. *Circumciſe the forſkin of your heart*, or, Jer. 44. *Circumciſe your ſelves to the Lord, to be as much as forgive your own ſins, it would be thought ſtrange.* Diſceptatio, pag. 147. yea, he makes the contrary plainly to appear. As for thoſe texts, *Titus* 3. 5. 1 *Corinthians* 6. 11. *Epheſians* 5. 25, 26. they ſpeak all to the ſame thing; In every one of them a real, habitual change is mentioned, *Acts* 2. 38. Remiſſion of ſinnes is indeed mentioned, and very probably, *Acts* 22. 16. But in what ſenſe to be underſtood, I have ſhewed in the laſt place; ſo that I think there is ſo much yielded, and ſo little proved by the eminent advocates in this cauſe, (that according to Scripture, there is any ſuch cauſality in Baptiſme for the pardon of ſinne in every Infant that is preſented to that ordinance, and received) that even upon this account it is juſtly to be ſuſſpected. Beſides, that the blood of Chriſt and his Spirit are not onely diſtinguiſhed by them, but divided; The vertue of his blood, is aſcribed to thoſe that have no portion in his Spirit, as though that Chriſt came, both by water and blood unto ſome: and by blood onely unto others.

[x] Cordis circumciſione peccatorum remiſſionem denotari ut credam, nihil adhuc quod ſuadeat video, quod cogat multo minus. Certe ſi quis verba illa, Deut. 10. 16, Circumcidite ergo præputium cordis veſtri] aut illud etiam, Jer. 44. Circumcidimini ſive circumcidite vos Jehovæ] expoſuerit, Remittite vobis peccata veſtra; γέλωτα (pute) ὀφλήσει.

SECT. III.

Objections againſt the former doctrine.

Obj. 1. HEre it is objected, *Where the blood of Chriſt on Gods part is offered, and applyed for pardon of the guilt of ſin, and no impediment put on his part that receives it, there the guilt of ſin is remitted; But in the Baptiſm of Infants, the blood of Chriſt on Gods part is offered and applyed, and no impediment put by him that receives it*; Ergo *in the Baptiſme of Infants the guilt of ſin is remitted.*

Anſw. 1. *Anſw.* 1. This Argument will hold with equal ſtrength for proof of that which theſe deny; as for that which they would aſſert,

aſſert, Where the Spirit of Chriſt is offered on Gods part, and applyed for regeneration, and true ſanctification, and no impediment put by him that doth receive it, there regeneration, ſanctification, and all other gracious habits are wrought: But in the Baptiſme of Infants the Spirit of Chriſt is thus offered, and applyed, and no impediment is put: *Ergo*, The Major in this ſyllogiſme can be no more denyed, then in the former. The Spirit of Chriſt is as efficacious for regeneration, as his blood for pardon; It were over-much boldneſſe to put any difference between them. And for the Aſſumption, none can deny but the Spirit is as well applyed in Baptiſme, as blood; either then both muſt hold, or both muſt be denyed.

2. I utterly deny, that the blood and Spirit of Chriſt, that either blood or Spirit, are thus applyed in Baptiſme; In caſe of ſuch application, they would produce their effects, above, and againſt all reſiſtance, there is no vain application of either of theſe to any perſon. If the Spirit of Chriſt had been in Baptiſme applyed to *Simon Magus*, it would ſo have ſeazed upon him, and wrought in him, that *Peter* would not have addreſſed himſelf to him in that language, which he heard from him, and ſo I may ſay of the blood of Chriſt, ſuch an application of it to his ſoul, would have had that effect, that *Peter* would have ſaid to him in the words of the *Seraphim* to *Iſaiah*, when he had applyed the coal from the Altar to his mouth, *Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy ſin is purged*; and not as he did, that *thou art in the gall of bitterneſſe, and the bond of iniquity*. The blood of Chriſt upon the ſoul of an Infant, or man of years, muſt needs be as efficacious as a coal from the Altar on *Iſaiah*'s lips. Univerſal redemption, we know, is aſſerted by theſe Authors, though it be with ſuch limits, as not to cloſe with *Arminians*, but to remain their oppoſite. If now there be not onely impetration of the merit of Chriſt, but alſo application in that latitude as Baptiſme is adminiſtred. I know nothing that can ſtand in the way of ſalvation, of all thoſe that are baptized. He that would ſee the conſent of modern Writers, of the moſt eminent note, in the denyal of this propoſition, let him conſult learned Mr. *Gataker*, Diſcep. pap. 6, &c. whereby his induſtrious pains (after his manner) many are multiplied; *Danaus* leads the way, *He is deceived* (ſaith he) *that thinks that Chriſt and his benefits, are applyed by the ſign of water, which is onely the ſeal of ſuch application.*

2.

3.

3. According to theſe principles laid by theſe Authors, no guilt of ſin is taken away by Baptiſme, either in Infants, or men of years: for either it is pardoned before Baptiſme, or elſe a barre in Baptiſme is put againſt the pardon of it. If they are regenerate before Baptiſme, then ſin is pardoned before they are baptized. In caſe they are unregenerate when they are tendred to Baptiſme, then there is a barre put to it. Original ſin in Infants is mortal, otherwiſe they would be ſaved without Baptiſme, as well as in it. And ſin in the unregenerate is mortal likewiſe. There are therefore barres put by both of theſe, or at leaſt an impediment found, and conſequently no mans ſin is thus remitted upon account of his Baptiſme.

Obj 2. Secondly, It is objected. *Every Infant is conceived and born in ſin* [*ordinarily,*] *which David confeſſes of himſelf*, Pſal. 51. 5. *Of unclean ſeed*, Job. 14. 4. *A child of wrath*, Eph. 2. 3. *and held under Original guilt. But there is a promiſe of remiſſion of ſin made to the Infant, when it is initiated by the Sacrament of Baptiſme: Repent and be baptized every one of you, for remiſſion of ſins*——; *for the promiſe is made to you, and your children*, Acts 2. 38, 39.

Anſw. 1. *Anſw.* 1. It was not with good advice, that birth-ſin, confeſſed by *David*, is in the Major propoſition branched out in that latitude, as to comprize both uncleanneſſe and wrath; For it makes way for the Aſſumption to be as large, namely that in Baptiſme the Spirit is promiſed, and applyed, to take away filth as well as blood, to deliver from wrath, otherwiſe the remedy doth not anſwer the malady. And ſo we have more in the concluſion then they would have, though no more then is in the premiſes, *viz.* that in Infant Baptiſme there is both remiſſion of ſin, and regeneration. The Infant is thus made, both happy and inherently holy.

2. Secondly, The fruit of Baptiſme, a right carried on, (conſcience anſwering to baptiſmal engagements) is indeed forgiveneſſe of ſins: But the promiſe in that place mentioned, is not remiſſion of ſins (ſuppoſedly to follow upon the act of Baptiſme), but it is that which did denominate them children of the promiſe, namely the promiſe made to *Abraham*, Gen. 17. and continued to them who were his off-ſpring, which argued them to be yet in Covenant. And the Apoſtle makes uſe of it, as a motive to preſſe them to accept of Baptiſme, the preſent initiating ſeal of

of it. See this text further spoken to, Treatise of the Covenant, Chap. 37, 43.

Thirdly, It is objected. *That which Baptisme figures, that it works, otherwise it is a sign that is fallacious: But Baptisme figures out remission of sin, and the taking away the guilt of it.* *Obj.* 3.

Answ. 1. Baptisme also figures out a further work, of regeneration, and sanctification, *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 11, 12. *Answ.* 1.

2. This Proposition universally understood, without any limits, is denied on all hands. They that assert this Sacramental work, will have it to be with this proviso, that no barre be put by the receivers. 2.

3. Sacraments do effect what they figure, as seales effect what the Covenant conveyes, upon Covenant-terms, all is effected that in Sacraments is figured. The Apostle tells us with what limits this proposition holds, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. 3.

4. The great objection is. *If Sacraments have no other work upon the soul, then by way of sign and seal, as they have their influence upon the understanding, and faith of the receivers, then infant baptisme is useless, and unprofitable; there is no end why they should be baptized, seeing there is no work wrought, either upon their understanding, or faith in this ordinance, and so their Baptisme is vain and needlesse. And therefore upon this account, complaint is made by some friends of Infant Baptisme, that the doctrine* de nudis signis *(as it is called) making Sacraments bare and empty signes, is the ground of Anabaptisme. And the greatest sticklers against Infant Baptisme, have publickly professed, that if that tenent of the* opus operatum *(as we may call it) in Sacraments could be clearly proved, they would no longer oppose that practice.* *Obj.* 4.

Answ. 1. If the doctrine *de nudis signis* were (as is objected) the ground of Anabaptisme, then I marvel how it comes to passe that that doctrine ceasing, Anabaptisme doth not cease with it. I read *Calvin* and others (to whom in this I subscribe) opposing it, I know none that now assert it. As soon as *Calvin* hath done with refutation of one, he presently falls upon refutation of this other, I here oppose; It is hard to say, whether he be more zealous against the doctrine *de nudis signis*, Instit. lib. 4. cap. 14. Sect. 13. or against this other doctrine of Sacramental efficacy, Sect. 14. And *Chamier*, lib. 1. de Sacram. in gen. cap. 10. Sect. 11. having mentioned that use of Sacraments as distinguishing signs, faith, *Answ.* 1.

This

y Hic tamen nec ſolus eſt finis nec præcipuus Sacramentorum; itaque Anabaptiſtas æque cum Bellarmino improbamus, quos etiam ante illum Calvinus refutavit: quibus Sacramenta nihil ſunt quam ſigna inſtituta ad diſcernendum Chriſtianos à Judæis & Paganis, ut Romanis olim toga erat ſignum quo diſcernebantur à Græcis palliatis.

y *This is not yet the alone or chief end of them; therefore* (ſaith he) *we oppoſe Anabaptiſts, as well as* Bellarmine; *and* Calvin *alſo before him had refuted them, in that they make Sacraments nothing more then ſignes diſtinguiſhing Chriſtians from Jewes, and Pagans as a gown ſometimes was a ſign whereby a Roman was known from a Greek.* I remember when in the Divinity Schools, a reſpondent in his verſes (according to cuſtome premiſed) called the ſignes in the Sacraments, *ſurda elementa* (it may be *metri cauſâ*) The Dr. of the chair made a ſharp animadverſion on it. They that do not raiſe them ſo high, as to make them inſtruments of conveyance of this nature, yet do not ſet them ſo low, as to be naked and empty ſigns. They are not naked, though ſuch clothes, that every one woul put upon them, do not fit them.

2. It is no marvel that Anabaptiſts are ready to offer to come in to us, upon theſe terms, when this doctrine is fully cleared, being well aware, that it never will nor can be proved, and ſo they have a good ground given them to hold on in their oppoſition. Our great revilers of the place of our publick meetings, calling them by the name of Steeple-houſes, or thinking that too gentle, *Jeroboams* calve-houſes, I doubt not but will promiſe to forbear that language if it can be clearly proved, that they are of divine inſtitution, and that they have that holy ſanction put upon them, as once the Temple had at *Jeruſalem*; but when thoſe that put ſo high an honour upon them, riſe ſo high in their elogies, and yet fall ſo low in their proofs, they put an argument into their mouthes, and (as I may ſay) an axe or hammer into their hands to demoliſh them, making them to think that this is all that can be ſaid for them. Mr. *Fuller* in his hiſtory of holy warre, lib. 3. cap. 20. quoting out of *Reinerius* a charge againſt the Albigenſes, that they gave no reverence to holy places, anſwers, *It is true.* And then gives in this for a reaſon, *becauſe moſt in that age ran riot in adoring of Churches, as if ſome inherent holineſſe was ceiled to their roof, or plaiſtered to their walls, yea, ſuch as might more ingratiate with God the perſons and prayers of people there aſſembled.* Let men take heed that they raiſe not Sacraments above the honour that Scripture gives them, with like ſucceſſe as theſe did places of publick holy aſſemblies; a good cauſe hath not a greater adverſary then a weak argument taken up in the defence of it. This argument, I confeſſe, had it ground to ſtand upon, might be of force for the battery of Anabaptiſme,

baptisme, but having no Scripture-bottome, it presently falls before any adversary, and Anabaptisme gathers strength by the fall of it.

3. As to the argument it self, tending to evince the uselesse- 3.
nesse of infant-Baptisme, it may very fitly be parallelled with that Objection, made against *Pauls* doctrine, *Rom.*3.1. when he had made it his great businesse, to set circumcision on its right bottom, and declared, that it was not efficacious in the way that they expected, and that it was without use for salvation, unlesse it were answered with the Circumcision of the heart, an objection presently is raised, *What profit is there then of Circumcision?* so these likewise when Sacraments are not raised to that height, as the Schoolmen have advanced them, to be instruments of conveyance of grace by the work done, and as they expect from them, they presently demand, what profit? And affirm (as to infants at least) that they are useless.

4. That answer, which *Paul* gives to his Questionists, that de- 4.
manded what profit is there of Circumcision I give to those that demand, what profit is there of infant-Baptisme? Having asserted in general, *Much every way*: he answers more punctually, instancing in one eminent priviledge, that virtually comprized all the external priviledges enjoyned by *Israel* as Church-members, *chiefly that to them were committed the Oracles of God.* It was said before that these priviledges in all Sacraments, are either actually conferred or infallibly evidenced. In Baptisme a true title is legally conferred. Upon account of our baptisme we have an orderly and legall right, and title to all succeeding Church-priviledges, as the Jewes had done upon account of their Circumcision, though there be not alwayes an aptitude for actual admission to them, or improvement of them. Upon this ground infants have, 1. Their share and interest in all the prayers made for the Church collectively, even in all that are preferred to God by his people for *Zion* and *Jerusalem.* This was the duty of every son of *Zion*, *Psal.*122.6. This was the faithfulls practice, *Psal.*51.18. and in these, infants as Church-members had their interest, on this account infants were brought to Christ, *That he might put his hands upon them, and pray*, Matth.19.13..2. They have their share in the blessings of the Church; we see with what solemnity it was to be done, *Num.*6.22. *&c. The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons,*

Priviledges following upon infant-baptisme.

ſaying, On this wiſe ye ſhall bleſſe the children of Iſrael, ſaying unto them, The Lord bleſſe thee and keep thee, &c. and they ſhall put my Name upon the children of Iſrael, and I will bleſſe them. Infants had their ſhare here, and upon this account infants were bleſſed of Chriſt, *Mar.* 10. 16. 3. Their relation to God by virtue of Covenant-intereſt, is hereby evidenced and ratified. How tranſcendent a priviledge this is to have the Lord for our God; we ſee, *Pſal.* 144. 15. having reckoned up ſeveral mercies, the Pſalmiſt concludes, *Happy is the people that is in ſuch a caſe, yea, happy is that people whoſe God is the Lord.* This is the priviledge of every infant, that upon Covenant title is baptized; God will not ſuffer their enemies to paſſe without vengeance. As it was an acceptable work to daſh the infants of *Babylon* againſt the ſtones, *Pſal.* 137. 9. being a ſeed growing up againſt God; ſo it is as diſpleaſing, and provoking to harme theſe, that are a ſeed dedicated unto, and growing up for God. 4. Baptiſme teaches them to know as ſoon as they are of capacity to learn to whom they belong, what Maſter they are to ſerve, and in what School they are to be trained. 5. A neceſſity is ſeen to get the knowledge of Chriſt, and timely to walk in his wayes. 6. A delight is wrought in them, towards thoſe in whoſe communion they are bred, and that own them as theirs, whereas being debarred in childhood from this ſociety, and denyed this badge, it is the way to bring them to maligne them: each one is apt to love thoſe of his owne fraternity, and on the contrary to ſtudy the oppoſition of others. 7. The aggravation of their ſin preſently rings in their ears, by reaſon of the favour they receive from God, the ſociety into which they are incorporated, when their converſation doth not in ſome meaſure anſwer their profeſſion. 8. Parents here ſee a ſtrong engagement, to bring them up for Chriſt, whom they have thus dedicated to him, and put into the fellowſhip of thoſe who are his Saints and members. When they have brought forth children unto God, they ſee their ſin heightned in giving them to *Moloch*, or any other beſides God, and there is no example of any believing parent in all the Scripture bringing up a child for Covenant, but in Covenant with the Lord. Theſe alone, though more might be added, might ſtop the mouthes of all that inſultingly move this queſtion.

5. That which in preſent does not, but hereafter may work upon the underſtanding, is not vain and uſeleſſe when it is done.

That

That was not vain which Christ did to *Peter*, *Joh.* 13. 17. when he said unto him, *What I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter.*

6. Seals of purchases taken in infants names, are of use to infants; though during infancy they know not how to make actual improvement themselves of them: If Baptisme hath its actual use in behalf of infants, whilest infants, as hath been shewed, and remains with them, to be improved by their understanding and faith, when they come to maturity, it cannot be thought to be vain and useless.

SECT. IV.

A Corollary from the former doctrine.

THen it followes by way of necessary Corollary from that which hath been said; that *unless the soul answer to Sacramental engagements, Sacraments are not efficacious for salvation to the receivers.* This is a clear result from that which hath been said, and is fully delivered by the Apostle, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. speaking of the Arke of *Noah, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water*: he adds, *The like figure whereunto Baptisme doth now save us by the resurrection of Christ.* The Arke did save those that entered into it; Baptisme doth save those that are received into the Church by it. And whereas an objection is obvious, that *Noahs* Arke, and New-Testament-Baptisme doth much differ, and that in the very thing inwhich the similitude is brought; few entered the Arke, and were saved by it, but myriads of thousands are baptized; This the Apostle answers, in the Parenthesis there interposed, that the parallel lies not between the Arke and the outward act of Baptisme, as by man administred, and there called *the putting away the filth of the flesh*, (so there is a vast disproportion, the outward act, as administred by man saves not,) but between the Arke and the inward work, which is *The answer of a good conscience towards God.* That of *Tertullian* (which *Beza* sayes, may serve as a Comment upon these words) is elegant: *The soul is established by answering, and not by washing.* And further

Answer to Sacramental engagements necessary to salvation.

ther to clear this text, we must know that the Covenant hath a Proposition in it, to which all in Covenant must give assent. *He that believes, and repents, shall be saved.* This assent is presupposed in all those that make actual improvement of the Sacraments. Faith and Repentance being the terms of the Covenant. And this Divines in their Treatises of Conscience call συνείδησις. Now in case we have the benefit of salvation by Sacraments, conscience must answer (and a good conscience, onely can answer) But I believe I repent. This Divines call συνείδησις: Then and not otherwise Sacraments save. Dr. *Slater* on *Rom.* 2.25. hath these words: *Here I think the observation is ease, out of the body of the text, that the work done in Sacraments availes not to righteousnesse or salvation except the condition of the Covenant be performed by those that partake them; first the condition, then the Antithesis shewes it, if thou be a breaker of the Law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision, that is all one to thee, as if thou hadst never been circumcised: yea, a gentile wanting the Sacrament, having obedience, is nearer heaven then thou that hast the Sacrament and neglecteſt obedience: and weigh well that the Lord in promising or sealing binds not himself to performance, but conditionally, that we perform our restipulation; and whence Sacraments should have their efficacy, but from the promise and grace of God I see not.* Circumcision in the flesh engaged the receivers to circumcision in the heart, *Deut.*10.16. where these did concurre, there was a man in Covenant, and upright in Covenant: And, *Jer.*9.25. wrath is denounced of God against several Nations; and the circumcised, and the uncircumcised, in the threat are put in equipage together, equally and alike to suffer. And to take off all scruple or offence that might be taken, there is a distinction brought of Circumcision in the flesh, and Circumcision in heart. *Judah* had Circumcision in the flesh to plead, but remained uncircumcised in heart, and therefore fares no better then those that were uncircumcised in flesh, *Jer.*4.4. The Prophet commands, *Circumcise your selves to the Lord, and take away the foreskin of your heart, ye men of Judah, and inhabitants of* Jerusalem, *lest my fury come forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings.* On these terms the fury of the Lord is prevented. Those *Israelites* that passed out of *Egypt*, into the wilderness for *Canaan*, had the *Cloud*, and the *Sea* of the same use as Baptisme: And *Manna*, and

and the *Rock* of the ſame uſe as the Lords Supper. The two former are called by the name of *Baptiſme*, and the two latter, *Spiritual meat*, *Spiritual drink*. All were baptized in the one, and all did eat and drink of the other; yet (ſayes the text) *with many of them God was not well pleaſed, for they were overthrown in the wilderneſſe.* If you would know who ſuffered thus under Gods diſpleaſure, the text tells you, *Luſters after evil things*, v. 6. *Idolaters*, v. 7. *Fornicators*, v. 8. *Tempters of Chriſt*, v. 9. *Murmurers*, v. 10. And *Heb.* 3. 17. The Apoſtle demanding, *But with whom was God grieved fourty years?* anſwers, *Was it not with them which had ſinned, whoſe carcaſes fell in the wilderneſs?* Further demanding *to whom ſware he, that they ſhould not enter into his reſt, but to them that believed not?* Theſe wanting the anſwer of a good conſcience, fell ſhort of the Sacramental engagements, and alſo came ſhort of true happineſſe. This might be further evinced with arguments.

Arguments evincing it: 1.

1. In this caſe where the ſoul anſwers not to Sacramental engagements, Sacraments are but as outward ſhadowes, and bare empty ſigns, and ſet out by the Spirit of God in Scripture with all their Rites and Ceremonies, (as other Ordinances of like nature) in the moſt low, deſpicable and undervaluing words that is poſſible. Baptiſme in the letter, is no better with the Apoſtle then *putting away the filth of the fleſh*; the cleanſing of the hands, the feet, or face from dirt or filth, is the ſame with it. The Phariſees waſhing of hands, yea, their waſhing of cups, platters, (as low as it is laid by our Saviour) was as efficacious and as acceptable. Circumciſion alſo when it led not to, but from Chriſt, is called by the Apoſtle by the name of *Conciſion*, Phil. 3. 2. Any gaſh made in the fleſh, or rent in the garment, as well pleaſeth. The Apoſtle therefore, *Rom.* 2. 25. ſaith, *Circumciſion verily profiteth if thou keep the Law, but if thou be a breaker of the Law, thy circumciſion is made uncircumciſion.* If you underſtand the Apoſtle ſpeaking the ſenſe of the carnal Jewes, with whom he had to deal, then you muſt underſtand the keeping of the Law in its full perfection; for to this Circumciſion, lookt upon, as a leading Law-Ceremony, did engage: *He that is circumciſed is a debtor to the whole Law*: if we underſtand him ſpeaking of it as a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, then ſincerity is intended. If this be wanting, Circumciſion is uncircumciſion: where that of the heart is, there Circumciſion in Gods account, is; and where it is not,

not; there Circumcision is not, *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. *We are the Circumcision*, saith the Apostle, *that worship God in Spirit and truth*, when the cutting of the foreskin in those false teachers was no better then Concision, the worship of God in Spirit in whomsoever it was, was Circumcision.

Arg. 1. 2. Sacraments in this case are onely aggravations of sin, and heightning of judgements. In case of uncircumcision in the time of the Law, and Non-baptisme in these times, sins were no more then transgressions of the Law; but now they are breaches of Covenant: Then they would have been meerly rebellion against Soveraignty, but now they are Apostasie, and treacherie. In Sacraments we close with God, and take his Name upon us as his servants; in sin we depart from him, and refuse to serve him: Thus our bond is broke, and our most solemn engagements with God made void. In Baptisme we undertake a profession of Christ, in wayes of sin we are treacherous towards him and stand up in hostility against him. When those *Israelites*, *Jer.* 34. had covenanted with God to put away their servants, which contrary to the Law they had kept in bondage, and afterwards served themselves of them; we see what followes upon it, the Lord proclaims liberty to them, *to the sword, to famine and pestilence.* When we have once covenanted to put away our sins, we have lesse reason to serve our selves of them, or rather again to serve them, then these *Israelites* had to serve themselves of their bond men and bond-women. The highest reproach is this way cast upon Christ. No man leaves one Master, to betake himself to the service of another, but he prefers in his judgement the latter before the former, especially when he breaks all Bonds, Covenants, and Engagements for such an exchange of service. When a penitent person leaves sin to come over to Christ, Christ hath honour. It appears that he is now in dislike with sin, and better pleased with Christ. But when a man leaves Christ, and his wayes to serve sin, there is a reproach cast upon Christ; and of this he is very sensible, *Jer.* 2. 5. *What iniquity have your Fathers found in me, that they are gone from me, and walked after vanity, and became vain?* An aspersion of iniquity is cast upon a Master, when he is left, and the vainest of men is chosen; and this cast upon Christ in the highest way in a Christians turning to sin, and in this case we see in what manner he expostulates and complaines.

3. In

3. In this caſe where conſcience anſwers not to Sacramental engagements, thoſe two ſeals vouchſafed of God for his peoples benefit will ſtand one oppſite to the other, and will not anſwer each other. The ſeal of the Sacraments, and the ſeal of the Spirit, will be thus divided. The former may ſerve to give aſſurance that they are Gods in a viſible relation, but the other will be wanting to give an inviſible title. This reſtipulation of conſcience being no other then Sanctification, and Sanctification the impreſſion that the Spirit makes by way of ſeal, when we are not onely not aſſured of this work of the Spirit, but aſſuredly want it, then our want of intereſt in Chriſt is evident: for if any man have not the Spirit of Chriſt, he is none of his. The viſible ſeal in the want of this impreſſe on their ſpirits is neceſſarily inefficacious. *Arg.* 3.

4. When conſcience anſwers not to Sacramental engagements, in participation of Sacraments, men ſubſcribe to the equity of their own condemnation, and give aſſent to the ſentence of death pronounced againſt them. Coming for the ſeals of the Covenant, they ratifie and eſtabliſh the terms of the Covenant. Now the Covenant hath penalties as well as promiſes, puniſhments as well as mercies; conſcience anſwering to Covenant-engagements, they are intereſted in mercies, conſcience witneſſing the contrary, they neceſſarily become lyable to judgements, and therefore the Apoſtle ſayes, *He that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgement to himſelf.* That very kind of eating hath an obligation in it to ſuffering, and the equity of ſuch obligation, by ſuch a communicant is acknowledged. If an idle, unfaithful, purloyning, run-away apprentice, ſhould bear ſtripes from his Maſters hand, and ſhould upon it, produce his Indentures to implead his Maſter for reparations, theſe Indentures will give full evidence to the juſtice of his ſufferings, or a man that enjoyes a leaſe with ſeveral clauſes of forfeiture, and by non-payment of rent, or otherwiſe makes forfeiture, the producing of his leaſe for ratification of his title proves a nullifying and deſtruction of it: This is the caſe of an unbelieving, impenitent, diſobedient Chriſtian. All therefore that willl find comfort iu Baptiſme, and expect it at the Lords Table, muſt ſtudy to come up to Covenant-engagements, and exerciſe themſelves continually to have a conſcience void of offence, both towards God, and toward man. *Arg.* 4.

SECT.

SECT. V.

A case of Conscience upon occasion of the former Corollary answered.

When it is that Conscience answers to Sacramental engagements.

HEre a great question lyes, When it is that conscience thus answers to Sacramental engagements, so that we may conclude their efficacy for salvation, and when it is that they come short, and so in our claim of them, we subscribe, as hath been said, to the equity of our own condemnation?

To this I answer, that every soul must make it his great businesse, all the daies of his life to get abilities, to give satisfaction to this demand, and all the books that have been written in positive Divinity, and Cases of Conscience are little enough for directions for it; yet to speak something for their help, that desire to look into it, in their enquiries into Scriptures, and the labours of the learned in this particular, they must first distinguish between keeping of Covenant, failings in Covenant, and forfeiture of it; between keeping in the way, straying out of the way, and a total resolved leaving of it. He may fail that makes not a total forfeiture. And for discovery of these which I call failings in Covenant, we must yet distinguish of sins, some are meer infirmities and unavoidable weaknesses; others are sins above infirmities, presumptuous acts, or at least acts of inadvertency, or carnal security. As for those that are meer infirmities, and unavoidable weaknesses, unto which *Noah*, *Lot*, *Abraham*, *David*, *Job*, *Nathaniel*, to whom God gives largest testimonies, (when in their walk they were most exact and circumspect) were subject, I take them not to be so much as failings in Covenant, seeing we never Covenanted with God to be above infirmities, or never to be any more found in any weaknesses; These with sincere hearts keep up to their Covenant engagements. Of such it is testified that they were *upright*, *perfect*, *without guile*. The promise then made to those *that keep Covenant, and that remember to keep Gods Commandements, to do them*, Psal. 103. 18. is theirs. These are no Spirit-grieving sins. Complaint is made of God, of those that grieve the holy Spirit of God, *Isa.* 63. 10. *Psal.* 95. 9. but no complaint is made of these persons, they are men after Gods

own

own heart, 1 *Sam.* 13. 14. His delight, *Prov.* 11. 20. The effects which grief hath with men, is not seen in Gods dealings with them; He departs not from them upon this occasion, neither doth he upon this account afflict them. Whereas some say, that God in Justice may damne for the least sin, and therefore he may much more afflict; I answer, The Covenant of Grace supposed, this cannot (as I think) stand with Justice, he is otherwise engaged to the believing and penitent, and no instance can be given of his punishment of unavoidable weaknesse. He brings not his sword upon them to avenge the quarrel of his Covenant. Though sin whersoever it is, is opposite to Gods Spirit, yet God is well pleased in their bearing up, and holding opposition against it. These walk up to their Covenant-vow made in Baptisme, and come every way fitted for the Lords Table. In application of themselves to the one, and looking back to the other, they find all manner of encouragements, and no cause of fears or terrours. Every promise made to the believing, sincere, upright, perfect, obedient, is theirs. These may sit down at the Lords Table, with all alacrity, having a work upon their spirits to abide for ever. When they are taken hence they shall change their place, but not their company and fellowship. Their humbling of their soulesunder weaknesses, plainly speaks their pressing after further strength. Their hatred of sin, speaks their love of Christ. Their resistance of sin, their care to walk with Christ. Of these Christ sayes, *Thou art all fair, my beloved, there is no spot in thee*, Cant. 4. 7. that is, universally fair: they are those that have respect to all Gods Commandments. And these, whilest such, and as such, come not within the compasse, either of failing in, or forfeiture of their Covenant.

Others are sins above infirmity and unavoidable weaknesses, and these are either meer breaches in, or violations of our Covenant with God; or else such breaches that are also forfeitures: and those I call meer breaches or violations of this kind, how foul soever, that are short of forfeitures, such as was *Davids* uncleanesse and blood, *Solomons* Idolatry, *Hezekiahs* pride, *Jonas* his flight to *Tarshish*, *Jobs* passion, *Peters* denyal of Christ, and whatsoever other sins that may stand parallell with these, whether of omission, or commission. These are sins above infirmities, towards presumption at least, much of will and consent

of heart is in them; these are outbreaches from God, and violations made upon our Covenant entred with him, notwithstanding they be not with full consent of heart, and afterwards broken off by repentance. And concerning these I shall first lay down severall Positions, and then apply all to our present purpose.

Positions holding forth the danger of notable sins in regenerate persons.

1. Though these sins thus acted do not take away all title to the Kingdome of heaven, yet they cloud and obscure the evidence and assurance of it. I know not how this can be made up to the soul, otherwise then by a practical syllogisme, inquiring as before into the answer of the conscience to Covenant-engagements. He that believes and repents shall be saved, is the bottome on which the whole edifice of assurance must stand, and how the soul, under so sad a witnesse, that conscience in this case is ready to give, can return answer, I believe, I repent, I yield sincere obedience, I cannot understand. Yea, Conscience in this plight will presently syllogize on the opposite hand. No Whoremonger, Idolater, Murderer, Drunkard, &c. hath title to the Kingdome of heaven. This is a Gospel-Proposition, and whatsoever other of like nature that conscience can assume, and how far this is from yielding matter of assurance, let any judge. Neither let election here be objected, seeing this is no bottome on which assurance can be built further than we find clear evidence of the fruits of it. Those unclean *Corinthians* reckoned up in that List, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. had no assurance of salvation from Election, in their unconversion. Nor yet can regeneration be objected, seeing these are not acts of the regenerate part. Unregeneration then bearing dominion and exercising present power, evidence is clouded. When *Hezekiah* was left to himself in the matter of the King of *Babylon*, he was not raised above himself in the beatifical vision. They that will keep up assurance, must keep off from sins.

Position 2.

2. Sin of this nature in a regenerate man brings an inaptitude on the soul in the present state to enter into glory. Heaven is a place of greater purity, then for a man to step out of Murder, and Adultery into it. In case a well-ordered discipline will not suffer such without censure in the Congregation, much lesse can we think him fit in that state for heaven. I wonder how those that pretend at least to keep up Church-Government to that height, that none that is impure may be suffered among them,

them, can yet in their doctrine ſet open the gates of heaven for to receive them. Is the viſible Church on earth in a more narrow latitude, then the ſtate of bliſſe? or may we without danger pervert Chriſts ſpeech, and ſay, Few are called, but many choſen? If *Miriam* upon ſin was not fit for the Camp for ſeven dayes, *Numb.* 12. 14. much leſſe are theſe immediately upon the acting of like enormities fit for glory. If any think that the merit of Chriſt ſteps in, and keeps from hell, yet doubtleſſe the Spirit of Chriſt hath not in preſent made them meet for glory. Some ſay, What if *David* had dy'd after his adultery, before his recovery? what then had been his caſe? He was a child of God, and could a child of God have periſhed? And I demand, What if *Paul* had dyed in his perſecution when he was exceedingly mad againſt Chriſtianity? He was elected, and could a choſen veſſel of God have been damned? He that can reconcile one of theſe, may be able eaſily to reconcile them both. An Elect perſon cannot be damned, and an enemy of Chriſt cannot be ſaved. A Child of God cannot dye, and a Murderer and Adulterer cannot live. We find therefore, that *Paul* did not dye in his Perſecution; he that choſe him to life, choſe him alſo to the acknowledgment of the truth. *David* did not dye in his Adultery; He that had adopted him for glory, wrought him to repentance for remiſſion of ſins. The ſalvation of both of them was doubtful reſpective to their eſtates now mentioned, in caſe we look onely at the men, being both in a plain road towards perdition; but the damnation of either of them was impoſſible, if we look at the election and purpoſe of God. Gods Election carries on undoubted and infallible effects, through doubtful and contingent means. [x] *Every action* (ſaith *Gandavenſis*) *depending upon two agents, whereof the one is neceſſary, and the other contingent, though it be neceſſary reſpective to the neceſſary agent, yet it is contingent and doubtfull on the part of the contingent agent.* *Quodl.* 4. *q.* 18. *The order and way of predeſtination,* ſaith *Aquinas, is certain, and yet the will of man produces its effects no otherwayes than in a contingent manner. An elect man may periſh, if we conſider his own power;*

[x] Omnis actus à duobus dependens, quorum unum eſt neceſſarium, alterum verò contingens; licet habet neceſſitatem ex parte neceſſarii, habet tamen contingentiam ex parte contingentis.

Ordo prædeſtinationis certus eſt, et tamen voluntas effectum ſuum producit non niſi contingenter. Prædeſtinatus poteſt perire, ſi conſideratur ipſius potentia: non poteſt, ſi conſideratur ordo quem habet ad Deum prædeſtinantem. Refert *Durenan.* epiſt. ad Dr. *Ward.*

power he cannot periſh if we look unto the order in which he ſtands in reſpect of God that predeſtinates. See the ſuffrage of the Divines of great Brittain, *art.* 5. *part.* 2. *theſ.* 3,4,5,6. Davenants *Epiſt. prop. ult.* *Burges* on Juſtification, pag. 240. The Aſſemblies confeſſion of faith.

Poſition 3. 3. Sins of this nature in an unregenerate man, bring him under Gods wrath and preſent diſpleaſure, though they do not work him into a ſtate of wrath or utter loſſe of his juſtified ſtate. They cauſe him to bear his Fathers frown, though he ſhall not dye as a Malefactor. He ſhall not enter into condemnation, yet he is not taken out of the hands of diſcipline; ſee *Iſai.* 57. 17,18. *For the iniquity of his covetouſneſſe was I wroth, and ſmote him; I hid me, and was wroth, and he went on frowardly in the way of his heart. I have ſeen his wayes, and will heal him, I will lead him alſo, and reſtore comforts to him, and to his mourners;* Theſe of whom the Prophet here ſpeaks, were a people of Gods everlaſting love, being thoſe whom he heals, and to whom he reſtores comforts. They were yet overmuch carried out to covetouſneſſe, and purſuit of creature contentments; Gods wrath was upon them for this miſcarriage of theirs, he was moved here upon to appear in diſpleaſure againſt them; he ſmites them in his wrath, and hides his face in diſpleaſure from them, having his eye open to their ſin, but his face withdrawn from their conſolation. *Num.* 20. 13. we may find *Moſes* and *Aarons* ſin, and the *Pſalmiſts* obſervation upon it, *Pſal.* 106. 32,33. *They angred him alſo at the waters of ſtrife, ſo that it went ill with Moſes for their ſake; becauſe they provoked his ſpirit, ſo that he ſpake unadviſedly with his lips.* *Moſes* ſuffers from God for his ſin, when he ſuffered the people to provoke him to ſin. This *Moſes* ſeems never to have done with, *Deut.* 1. 37. & 3. 26. & 4. 21. ſo that God puniſhes for ſin, and in anger puniſhes for it. If love and wrath cannot conſiſt, (as ſome would have it) then *Moſes* was none of Gods beloved. 2 *Sam.* 11. we find *Davids* ſin ſet out at length, and how it took with God, we find in the end of the chapter. The thing that *David* did, diſpleaſed the Lord; and that it was no otherwiſe in New-Teſtament-times is clear. As the oneneſſe and ſameneſſe of the Covenant which we and they were under, doth evince it; ſo alſo Gods dealings with the *Corinthians* upon their prophanation of the Lords Supper is a proof of it.

4. Sin

Poſition 4.

4. Sin thus committed is ſuch an obſtruction in the way of bliſſe and ſalvation, that there lyes a neceſſity on the ſoul to come in by repentance, and by prayer to make application to the throne of grace, in order to pardon and forgiveneſſe. This is Gods way to bring his into the wayes of ſalvation and life, when they have ſtept aſide into the wayes of death. To this end God keeps up Diſcipline with his own hand, as we may ſee, 1 *Cor.* 11. 31, 32. The Apoſtle having there reproved theſe *Corinthians* in a tart way for prophanation of the Lords Supper, and diſſwaded them from it by the deadly nature of the crime, they were herein *guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, and the danger they incurred, *eating and drinking judgement to themſelves*; he farther ſets before them preſent experiments of Gods hand, *For this cauſe many are weak and ſickly among you, and many ſleep*; In this place he lets them know how they might avoid this judgement, *If we would judge our ſelves, we ſhould not be judged.* Our examination and ſentence might avert the examination and ſentence of heaven. And then acquaints them with Gods end in this viſit of his, to correct as a Father, and not condemn as a Judge: *But when we are judged, we are chaſtened of the Lord, that we ſhould not be condemned with the world.* The application here is eaſie, They are the Elect of God, and of ſaving Goſpel intereſt, that are kept from condemnation. A way in ſin would have brought them, as others in the world, into condemnation: If they might have been ſaved in ſin, when the world was damned for ſin, this correction for that end did not need. To avoid condemnation therefore for ſin, God by his judgements laſhes them out of it: *By this ſhall the iniquity of Jacob be purged, and this is all the fruit, to take away his ſin.* So that the tendency of ſin, even in a child of God, is to bring to condemnation; and the care of God is by afflictions to take him off from ſin, that he might not be condemned. To this end Church-diſcipline is alſo ſet up of God, 1. *Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5. *For I verily as abſent in body, but preſent in ſpirit, have judged already as though I were preſent, concerning him that hath ſo done this deed, in the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, when ye are gathered together, and my ſpirit, with the power of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to deliver ſuch a one unto Satan, for the deſtruction of the fleſh, that the ſpirit may be ſaved in the day of the Lord Jeſus.* How farre that ſentence of giving up to Satan did reach, I ſhall not ſtand to determine, whether barely to caſt him out of the Church,

and put him among thoſe over whom Satan reigned, or as conſequent of it, horrors and terrors from Satan by Gods juſt permiſſion; when the Church leaves him off from their communion, God caſts him off from his protection and conſolation: which (as is ſaid) ordinarily followed upon this ſentence in Primitive times: The end is plain, *the deſtruction of the fleſh, that the ſpirit may be ſaved in the day of the Lord Jeſus.* If this mans former juſtification would have brought him on in his ſin without ſtep to ſalvation, all this had not needed, that his ſpirit might be ſaved. See further, 2 *Cor.* 7.9. the Apoſtles ſevere dealings with theſe *Corinthians* concerning this inceſtuous member, had caſt them down with grief, and this grief raiſed the Apoſtles ſpirit with joy, not that they had grieved, but that their grief had ſo happy an iſſue. *Now I rejoyce not,* (ſaith he) *that ye were made ſorry, but that ye ſorrowed to repentance,* adding, ver. 10. *For godly ſorrow works repentance to ſalvation not to be repented of.* They were ſtepping therefore out of the ſalvation-way, repentance brings them back This in reaſon is plain; If new ſins thus committed occaſion no ſuch obſtruction, as to bring a neceſſity of repentance, (as ſome would have it) then the free grace of God gives a man full liberty to ſin, & opens a gap to all ungodlineſſe; this will then follow, which ſome have prophanely inferred from ſome Goſpel-principles, Live as I liſt, and ſhall be ſaved. What ſhall hinder, if no way in ſin either hath any tendency to condemnation, or is any obſtruction in the way of ſalvation? Some I know to avoid this, ſpeak of that holy, filial, ingenuous diſpoſition in a child of God, that in caſe he were ſet free from any ſuch danger, and let looſe to all the devils in hell; he would abhor ſin, and have in deteſtation all that is evil, but I do not find God giving in his teſtimony of any ſuch ingenuity. If all the children of God were thus towardly, all thoſe rods that he uſes were needleſſe; and if juſtification might be thus carried on in ſin, Chriſt would not have found reaſon to have ſaid, *Straight is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth to life,* Matth. 7.14. It was ſufficiently broad in caſe ſin would lead us in at it. Neither would the Apoſtle have ſaid, *If the righteous ſcarcely be ſaved, where ſhall the ungodly and the ſinner appear?* 1 Pet 4.18. The righteous might thus be ſaved with eaſe, and the wicked and ſinners ſalvation would be alike eaſie.

Theſe in this poſture under the preſent power of luſt or temptation,

tation, are not as they ought mindful of their Covenant, but are in a high way of violation of it. Their Baptism-vow is not as it ought kept up, and their adventure to come to the Lords Table for renewing of their Covenant, (the strength of lust still remaining) is a further provocation of the Lord. Upon this account the *Corinthians*, (as we have heard) smarted. God will not bear so high a dishonour of so great an Ordinance. It is an high presumption for a soul, under such present defilements; to dare to approach so nigh his presence, otherwise then in order to humiliation, and more strict renewed engagements against such practices. He that comes in this posture might here see the hatefulnesse of his present way to the height set out, and the justice of the heavyest, smartest stroke, that can be laid. As *Joab* sometimes abominated a sin that *David* acted, 1 *Chron.* 21.6. though *David* was a man in the general frame of his soul, upright with God, and *Joab* (as we may fear) far from it; so some that never had that change on their heart, yet under present convictions, and resolutions against sin, with the Publican, *Luk.* 18. and intelligent in the wayes of God with that Scribe *that was not far from the Kingdome of heaven*, Mark 12.34. may be otherwise accepted at the Lords Table, then these persons notwithstanding their habitual graces.

The application of these rules respective to Sacraments.

To distinguish these which are unavoidable weaknesses, and not of that danger to a man upright in Covenant, from such sins that are violations and breaches of it, and of that peril as hath been said, some Rules might be delivered.

Rules to discern the nature and quality of sins.

1. The more there is of light, the lesse there is of weaknesse, and so the crime more hainous, and violation of Covenant more dangerous. A man of dimme sight, whether through want of abilities to apprehend or helps vouchsafed to understand, is under an unavoidable impossibility to reach that exactnesse which others much above them in light may compasse; so that one Rule will not serve to discover the weaknesse of all, *but to whom much is given, of him God will require the more.* Graciously disposed souls walk up to that which they know, but cannot attain to that which they see not. That may be from weaknesse in one, which is out of will, and perversenesse in another. Sincerity admits of degrees, differenced according to mens several abilities.

Rule 1.

2. The lesse there is of temptation, the more of sin, and lesse of

Rule 2.

of weakneſſe; The bowle may run more evenly towards the mark whileſt it meets with no rubs, but a rub neceſſitates ſome unevenneſſe in the running. Temptations of this kind are of two ſorts, ſome from within, from mens natural conſtitution and temper. It is above poſſibility for ſome men to be in that meaſure free from all appearance and evidence of covetouſneſſe, ambition, lightneſſe, paſſion or the like, as ſome others. He is not fartheſt from weakneſſe, in whom leaſt appears of failings; but he that is leaſt vigilant, and makes leaſt reſiſtance. There are many of choiſe principles, that yet by reaſon of the temper of their natures are men of ſtrong temptations. And the Heathen could ſee that it is [a] *an hard thing to beat back natures inclinations.* I have heard of an eminent man, to whom one that very well knew him ſaid, Thou haſt grace enough for ten men, but all is too little for thy ſelf; There was ſuch a crabbed nature for it to deal with. It is hard for theſe by the help of much grace to appear in their walk equall to thoſe that are in grace farre their inferiours. As there are temptations from within, ſo there are aſſaults from without in like manner. Satan hath more free ſcope, and rope-length given him towards ſome, then towards others; and at ſometimes more towards the ſame perſons, then at other times; in which *Job* is an eminent example, Commiſſion after Commiſſion is given to Satan againſt him, the later ſtill exceeding the former. The world with more impetuous violence ſets upon ſome, then others, and at ſome times with greater violence then at others. *The proud have had me greatly in deriſion, yet have I not declined from thy Law*, Pſal. 119.51. *The bands of the wicked have robb'd me, but I have not forgotten thy Law*, Pſal. 119. 61. It is a very hard thing in ſuch a caſe for a man to ſtand ſteady and upright. He that ſtands on an hill to take view of a fight, may ſee many diviſions from military rules; but in caſe he were to manage the fight, he might perhaps make more faults then he diſcovers. A ſheep hardly paſſes without loſſe of ſome wool through many briars.

[a] Naturam expellas furca licet, uſque recurret.

Rule 3. 3. The more there is of deliberation and conviction, the leſſe there is of weakneſſe, and the more of ſin. A man ſometimes is ſo ſurprized, and taken at a diſadvantage, that he knowes not how at preſent to act for the beſt for the ſafety of his perſon, or his wordly advantage, of which yet he uſes to be more ſenſible; much leſſe then is he alwayes able to do for the beſt for his Spi-

ritual

ritual and everlasting concernment. A dispute is sometimes held between a mans conscience, and his fears, when the danger is so sudden, and thereupon his fears so high, that the voyce of conscience cannot be heard, nor hath it leasure or strength to bring up the argument. But when there is opportunity offered, and much reason from conscience heard, more regard is then had to self, and lesse to God, in case sin be committed. This was *Francis Spira's* case, when he was put to it either to subscribe to Popery, or to run the hazard of all his worldly interests, having so much time to debate, and so much strength of reason against it, yet yeelding after this full debate, he could never find peace in himself afterwards.

4. In omissions; The more opportunity for the duty, the greater the neglect; the lesse the opportunity, through the multitudes of occasions, the more it is towards weakenesse. It is hard to have many Irons in the fire, and to see so well to all that none be burnt: several Kings are so far honoured in Scripture, that their hearts were perfect, and yet imperctions are noted in their government, which must be imputed to that multitude of businesses that lay on their hands, together with the many obstructions that were in their way for effecting of it.

SECT. VI.

Sinnes that are Covenant forfeitures.

AS these are failings in Covenant, and such as may be called violations of it, though God is not pleased to take hold of advantage, to proceed upon it: so there are forfeitures of Covenant, which do not onely blurre our evidence for heaven, and bring the soul under Gods present wrath and displeasure, but destroy all title to happinesse and glory: or if that phrase will not be born, they are such as give full evidence that we are without all title to it. To these we may speak in the Psalmists words, *What hast thou to do to delare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my Covenant into thy mouth? seeing thou hatest instruction and castest my words behind thee*, Psal. 50. 16, 17. As it is with those that hold by way of Lease from men, they so fail sometimes by non-

non-payment of rent, waſte made, or ſervice neglected, that they may be impleaded and brought under an arreſt: Sometimes they ſo fail that they run upon forfeiture of the whole, and all right and title through careleſſeneſſe is loſt. Thoſe already ſpoken to are juſtly proceeded againſt, but theſe that we are now upon are to be utterly ejected. They may with the ſons of *Keturah* have their portions (and the Pſalmiſt ſaies, *They have their portion in this life*, Pſal. 17. 14,) but they muſt never inherit with *Iſaac*. Concerning theſe the Prophet is reſolute, *Ezek.* 18. 13. *Shall he then live? he ſhall not live, he hath done all theſe abominations, he ſhall ſurely dye.* And if any object againſt this, as a legal text, we ſhall find the Apoſtle as peremptory, that *they have not any inheritance in the Kingdome of Chriſt and of God*, Eph. 5. 5. *that they ſhall not inherit the Kingdome of God*, twice repeated, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. as alſo, *Gal.* 5. 21. Now theſe are of ſundry kinds. *Some* in whom there is no appearance of God, or footſteps of piety and holineſſe, but ſuch whoſe tranſgreſſion ſpeaks within the heart of all, that there is no feare of God before their eyes: A prophane rabble that ſcarce make mention of God but when they blaſpheme. Others of a more civil, or more reſtrained courſe, that with the young man in the Goſpel, come up to the outſide, and letter at leaſt of moſt Commandments, and therefore of that generation that is pure in their own eyes, yet not cleanſed from their filthineſſe. *Some* are ſuch that underſtand little, or nothing of God or waies of godlineſſe, but with the high-way ground heare and underſtand nothing at all; *the Devil ſtealing away that which was ſown in their hearts, leſt they ſhould believe and be ſaved.* Others are men of parts and abilities, are confident of themſelves, with thoſe to whom *Paul* ſpeaks, *Rom.* 2. 19, 20. *That they are guides of the blind, lights to them which are in darkneſſe, inſtructers of the fooliſh, and teachers of babes, which have a form of knowledg and truth in the law*; perhaps of abilities to propheſy in the Name of Chriſt with thoſe mentioned by our Saviour, that claim the Kingdome of heaven upon that account, *Matth.* 5. 22. *Some* are univerſaliſts (as I may ſay) in ſinne at leaſt, with that prophane deboiſt youth that *obeyed not the voice of his teachers, nor enclined his ear to thoſe that inſtructed him, they are almoſt in all evil in the midſt of the Congregation or aſſembly*, Prov. 5. 13, 14. Others are of a more refined ſtamp, and ſomewhat reformed way that with *Herod* have learned to do many things after thoſe that they

Several ſorts of ſinners that make forfeiture of Covenant.

they hear, but yet have their reserved *Herodias*, some right hand that they will not cut off, some right eye that they will not pluck out; these are in the same condemnation. The Catalogue of sins shutting out of heaven, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. are not reckoned up copulatively, so that all must concurre to cast a man out, but disjunctively; any one held and continued in will serve for it. Neither fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers, &c. shall inherit the Kingdome of God. *Some* have their beloved, endeered lusts in a more open, outward way, their filthinesse of flesh to the defilement of the outward man in drunkennesse, gluttony, adultery, sensual pleasures: Others their spirit-filthinesse, distrust of God, inward pride, confidence in the arm of flesh, self-seeking and the like. *Some* are carried away in their affections onely whether sensitive or rationall, fixing them upon forbidden objects, but in the mean time hold the truth thus imprisoned in unrighteousnesse, *Rom.* 1. 18. Others have a taint in their judgements, *not holding the head, from which all the body by joynts, and bands having nourishment ministred, and knit together encreaseth with the increase of God*, Col. 2. 19. Though in this age these have many advocates, yet their case is the same with others, already mentioned. Heresie is a fruit of the flesh as well as adultery, fornication, drunkennesse, lasciviousnesse, Idolatry, witchcraft, and together with them shuts out of the Kingdome of heaven, *Gal.* 5. 19, 20, 21. If the Apostle would have been in that way indulgent towards it, as many would have all to be in these dayes, he had never so whetted in all his Epistles his pen against it. *Some* have their positive sins, as before named, others stand charged chiefly (I think seldome solely) with negatives. *They call not upon the Lord*, Psal. 14. 4. *She strengthened not the hands of the poor and needy*, Ezek. 16. 49. *She obeyed not the voice; she received not correction, she trusted not in the Lord, she drew not near to God*, Zeph. 3. 2. *Some* have their sins of a more deep dye, of a Scarlet-colour, sins of a great magnitude, whose very name might even astonish others, sins are seemingly and appearingly light or small, such as Papists have accounted venial, and most think it would be over-much rigour in God to proceed against them in eternal judgements, eying the matter of fact, and not the thwarting of the divine command. *Some* have their hand-sins, sins in action: Others have their thought-sins, their tongue-sins. *Some* carry their sins more clearly

without check or curb, having got a conſcience peaceably wicked: others have their girdes and gripes, many times brought into Melancholy dumps about them, with *Ahab* Sermon-ſick; and yet not able to bear it out againſt their luſts, but again return to their former courſes. Theſe and many others that ſtand up in a parallell equipage with theſe men in Covenant, profeſſedly Chriſtian, baptized into the Name of Chriſt, and having never profeſſedly renounced Chriſt, are forfeitures of the mercies of the Covenant. No *opinion* that they hold, *party* that they take, *name* that they think they have got, ſuppoſed intereſt that they have in Chriſt, can acquit them. They may be denominated *unſanctified, or unholy* men, (having not obtained that which the Apoſtle ſought in prayer, in behalf of the *Theſſalonians*, that they might be ſanctified throughout, in ſpirit, ſoul and body) ſanctification purifies all the unclean, and heales all the diſeaſed parts; *And no unclean perſon can inher it the Kingdome of God*, Eph. 5. 5. They are truely ſtyled *impenitent ones*. Repentance is a return to God, in the ſame latitude as our departure by ſin was from him; In every ſin of all theſe and of the like kind, we depart from God: In repentance therefore we are to return from every ſin to God. The Prophet tells us upon what terms our ſouls may be freed from ruine by ſin, *Ezek.* 18. 30. *Repent and turn your ſelves from all your tranſgreſſions, ſo iniquity ſhall not be your ruine; and unleſſe we repent, we ſhall all periſh*, Luk. 13. 3, 5. They are juſtly pronounced to be *void of grace*, there being that contrariety between grace and ſin; that they cannot reſt in the ſame ſubject, or lodge continually in the ſame heart, without oppoſition. Where grace is prevalent, ſin falls; and where ſin prevails, grace is excluded; and it is *the grace of God that brings ſalvation*, Tit. 2. 11. They are *void of the Spirit of regeneration*. As our birth-corruption hath in it the ſpawn of all ſin, ſo regeneration hath the ſeed of all grace. And *Except we be born again, we cannot ſee the Kingdome of God*, John 3. 3. Theſe are the men which by their claime of Baptiſme, and offer of themſelves to the Lords Table, ſubſcribe the equity of their own condemnation, and juſtifie the ſentence of death pronounced againſt themſelves. They accept the Covenant on thoſe terms on which it is tendered in the Goſpel; and upon theſe terms they are under the wrath of God, and lyable to the ſentence of eternal death. Yet not remedileſſely, helpleſſely, hopeleſſely,

The uſeleſſe-neſſe of Sacraments to theſe perſons.

as

as it is with thoſe oftentimes, that upon forfeitures of Covenant, fall into the hands of man; the forfeiture being once made, advantages are taken by many to the uttermoſt. The prodigal is an inſtance of the Fathers readineſſe to receive to mercy thoſe that have gone away from him in wayes of ſin; And the Prophet tells us, *Ezek.* 18.21,22. *If the wicked will turn from all his ſins that he hath committed, and keep all my ſtatutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he ſhall ſurely live, he ſhall not dye. All his tranſgreſſions that he hath committed, they ſhall not be mentioned unto him; in his righteouſneſſe that he hath done, he ſhall live.* And though it be a wickedneſſe that reaches to the higheſt violation of Covenant, yet this ſhall not hinder, *Jer.* 3.1. *They ſay, If a man put away his wife, and ſhe go from him, and become another mans, ſhall he return unto her again? Shall not that land be greatly polluted? But thou haſt played the harlot with many lovers; yet returne again to me, ſaith the Lord.* He that hath hitherto come in the higheſt degree of unworthineſſe to the Lords Table, as oft as he hath come to it, yet caſting that off, which was his unworthineſſe, and coming up to Gods terms, he is now received and accepted.

SECT. VII.

A further Corollary from the former Doctrine.

THen let all take heed that they look for no more from Sacraments, then God hath put into them, and hath promiſed to work by them, leaſt looking unto them, and waiting for them, as the troops of *Tema*, and companies of *Sheba*, for the ſtream of Brooks which vaniſh when they wax warm, and are conſumed out of their place, they be confounded, and coming thither be aſhamed. And this caveat is no more then needs, ſeeing men in all times have been wonderfully apt to delude themſelves upon account of their fruition of outward Church-priviledges; and in particular, Sacrament-priviledges. And to this they are induced by divers reaſons. 1. Becauſe Sacraments are an honour, which God hath vouchſaf'd to his people, and denyed to others that ſtand not in that relation, and they cannot think that

We are to look for no more from Sacraments then God hath put into them and promiſed to do by them.

Mens aptneſſe to delude themſelves in Sacramental priviledges.

that it is in vain, that ſuch an honour is conferred upon them. 2. There are great promiſes annext to them, and made to thoſe that make right improvement of them. The bread is the Communion of the body, and the wine in the Lords Supper the Communion of the blood of Chriſt, 1 *Cor* 10.16. It is the New Teſtament in Chriſts blood ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſins, *Matth.*26. 28. Baptiſme ſaves through the reſurrection of Chriſt, 1 *Pet.*3.21. As many as have been baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt, *Gal.*3.27. Inſomuch that we have been taught that in Baptiſme we are made children of God, members of Chriſt, and inheriters of the Kingdom of heaven; Theſe promiſes are ſtreight applied; without any eye had to the terms and Propoſitions annext to them, like unto men that look at dignities in offices, and never regard the burthens. 3. Intereſt in Sacraments is not onely a priviledge, but a duty; not onely an honour, but a work of obedience in them that partake of them. To be baptized with water, and to eat of the Bread, and drink of the Cup in the Lords Supper, is a duty, as it was to be circumciſed in the fleſh of the foreskin, and to eat the Paſchal Lambe at the time appointed, and there is danger in neglect of theſe: This gives ſome eaſe, and ſpeaks ſome peace to the conſcience, that they have done the Command of the Lord. 4. They are yet matters of eaſe, eſpecially New-Teſtament-Sacraments; Here is no mortification of the members, no crucifying of the fleſh, no cutting off the right hand, or plucking out the right eye; and therefore no marvel that men could wiſh that all Religion were in them, and hope that ſalvation may be gained by them. Laſtly, Thoſe of theſe conceits, have alwayes met with teachers to ſooth them up in them, and carry on their deluſion. How high was Circumciſion ſet up in the Apoſtles times, as in regard of the neceſſity of it, *Acts* 15.1. *Certain men which came down from Judea, taught the brethren and ſaid, Except ye be circumciſed after the manner of Moſes ye cannot be ſaved*: So alſo in regard of the power and efficacy of it? and therefore the Apoſtle was put to it to warn men in that way of the deluſion, and to give that undervaluing term of conciſion to it, *Phil.* 3. 2. After-ages produced Schoolmen, and Popiſh Writers to magnifie them, affixing, and limiting ſalvation (except in ſome caſes extraordinary) to the water in Baptiſme, and how great things they aſcribe to the body of Chriſt received, if no barre be put, (which

In all Ages ſome have over-highly advanced Sacramental priviledges.

(which they underſtand of the Sacramental bread) is very well known. But as ſome have obſerved, where poyſon growes, providence takes care that there be antidotes found, ſo none of theſe ever appeared in the Church, but ſome by the good hand of God have ſtood up in oppoſition. How mightily did the Prophet *Jeremy* oppoſe himſelf againſt that over-high opinion that the Jewes in his time had of Circumciſion? *Jer.* 9. 25, 26. As alſo *Paul*, making uſe of his authority againſt the Jewes in his time, and diſputing at large againſt it, *Rom.* 2. And the Apoſtle *Peter* foreſeeing (it ſeems) that Baptiſme would be ſet up as high among Chriſtians as ever Circumciſion was among the Jewes, makes it his buſineſſe to prevent it. Having affirmed that Baptiſme ſaves, he is careful to let us know that it is not by its own power, but by the reſurrection of Chriſt, that is, Faith in the Reſurrection: and further explains himſelf, that it is not the outward act alone, but as anſwered with an inward work that hath that power, as you have heard. And Popiſh Schoolmen making it their work (as we have heard) to advance Sacraments to that height, Proteſtant Writers in a full ſtream have appeared to ſet them on their right bottome, and to make it appear what it is that Scripture attributes to them, and what in their right uſe may be expected from them. *Calvin*'s words, *lib.* 4. *inſtit. cap.* 14. *Sect.* 14. are high and notable, having oppoſed the doctrine of *nuda ſigna*, which makes Sacraments to be bare and naked ſigns: *On the other hand* (ſaith he) [b] *we are to be advertis'd, that as thoſe weaken the efficacy of Sacraments, and utterly overthrow their uſe, ſo there are others on the other hand that aſſign I know not what vertue to them, ſuch that we never read that God ever put into them: which errour* (ſaith he) *dange-*

[b] Rurſum admonendi ſumus, ut iſti vim Sacramentorum enervant, uſumq; proſus evertunt, ita ab adverſâ parte ſtare alios qui arcanas neſcio quas virtutes Sacramentis affingunt, quæ nuſquam illis à Deo inſitæ leguntur. Quo errore periculoſè falluntur ſimpliciores et imperiti, dum et Dei dona quærere docentur ubi reperiri minime poſſunt et à Deo ſenſim abſtrahuntur, ut pro ejus veritate meram amplexentur vanitatem. Magno enim conſenſu Sophiſticæ Scholæ tradiderunt, Sacramenta novæ legis, hoc eſt, quæ in uſu nunc ſunt Eccleſiæ, juſtificare et conferre gratiam, modo non ponamus obicem peccati mortalis. Quæ ſententia dici non poteſt, quàm ſit exitialis et peſtilens, eoq; magis, quod multis ante ſæculis magna Eccleſiæ jactura in bonâ orbis parte obtinuit. Plane certe diabolica eſt, nam dum juſtitiam citra fidem pollicetur, animas in exitium præcipites agit: deinde quia juſtitiæ cauſam à Sacramentis ducit, miseras hominum mentes, in terram ſuâ ſponte plus ſatis inclinatas, hâc ſuperſtitione illigat ut in ſpectaculo rei corporeæ potius quam in Deo ipſo acquieſcant.

rously

rouſly deceives the ſimple, and unlearned; Whileſt they are taught to ſeek the gifts of God where they cannot be found, they are by degrees drawn from God to imbrace meer vanity inſtead of truth. For the Schooles of Sophiſters with great conſent have taught that the Sacraments of the new law, (that is, thoſe that are now in uſe among Chriſtians) do Juſtifie, and confer grace, provided that we put no barre of mortal ſin. Which opinion (ſaith he) *hath been of more deadly danger than can be ſpoken: and ſo much the more, becauſe for many Ages, to the great loſſe of the Church, it hath prevailed. It is certainly* (ſaith he) *devilliſh; for whileſt it promiſeth Juſtification without Faith, it caſts ſoules headlong to deſtruction. And upon that account, becauſe they derive the cauſe of righteouſneſſe or Juſtification from the Sacraments; by this ſuperſtition they ſo enſnare the poor ſoules of men, (over-much of their own accord inclined to earth) that they had rather reſt in a corporeall element than in God himſelf.* This is his entrance upon the diſpute. That which he hath further upon it, in four whole Sections is very well worth the reading. The conſent of other Writers of his time, and that have followed after him, as a cloud of witneſſes, might be produced: but this (as the Reader hath heard) is already done to my hand. And when ſome of reverend eſteem, and ſingularly deſerving in the Church of God, have gone overmuch on this hand, as ſoon as it was carried abroad in Manuſcripts, a learned Manuſcript of Mr. *Gatakers* met with it, and afterwards appearing in print as a *Poſthumous* work, this, as ſoon as it came to the Authors cognizance by his zeal to the truth followed it. And let me here adde to that which hath been ſaid, that if nothing elſe, yet experience might correct this overhigh conceit of the work of Sacraments. That which we evidently ſee is not wrought by Sacraments, we cannot believe they are aſſign'd of God to work. This Propoſition hath certainly reaſon in it; They certainly do that office, which God hath aſſign'd and appointed them. But we evidently ſee that they do not actually work all that they figure out, even where (according to theſe) there is no bar put; therefore there is no cauſe to believe that they are deſign'd of God for it. Here I might inſtance in their failing in the work of remiſſion of ſin in Infants, ſeeing when they come to growth we oft ſee them in that way of ſin, that ſtands not with actual forgiveneſſe. But I know that many that here are adverſaries confeſſe an interciſion of Juſtification,

stification, and therefore this is not against them: and others that admit not that doctrine speak of a double Justification, one, for the state of Infancy; another, of those that are of growth upon their acceptation of Christ by faith: and therefore though sins be remitted in Infancy, and afterward, upon their acting of sin, charged, here is no such intercision of justification, which Arminians hold, and their adversaries oppose. I shall therefore wave this, and instance in the failing of Baptisme in the work of regeneration, which is as well figured out in Baptisme, as that other of remission of sin. Baptisme comes not alone to remove the guilt; but also to correct the power of original corruption, and so to work in us a freedome from the power of sin, as well as the pardon of it. And in case Baptisme effects this work, how is it that sin in Infants is so apt to shew it self? that as soon as they act, they are so readily prone to act that which is evill. When *Saul* said he had done the Commandment of the Lord, *Samuel* had a confutation ready; *What means then* (sayes he) *this bleating of sheep, and lowing of oxen in mine ears that I hear?* 1 Sam. 15. 14. If Gods command had been done, a sheep had not been left to bleat, or an oxe to low in his hearing. Here is a real confutation as ready; If Infant-baptisme cleanses from original sin, the root being dead, what means such abundance of living, lively branches? How come all those complaints of the timely growth of sin in Christians children? Why have not Pædobaptists found a real confutation of their Adversaries in their issue? being able to shew them their young ones, as averse from sin as a fish is to a life in the ayr, when the children of their adversaries wanting that nature-healing medicine, are wholly addicted to it. Neither Israelites nor Christians were ever able to hold out such an experiment. And if this were our received doctrine, it would necessarily herein infinitely strengthen Anabaptisme; when Anabaptists have ever found the greatest opposition from their pens, that never acknowledged any such power in Sacraments. And in case it should fall out, that our Adversaries were in the truth, and we in an errour, concerning this power in Sacraments, I cannot possibly see what great danger can any way follow to us upon it, seeing that if Sacraments confer grace, this way, so far above our expectation, we among others shall yet have our shares in it. Our Infants are in no such errour with us, and they put no more bar to the working of Baptisme, then

the Infants of others. And therefore all benefits which thus follow upon Baptiſme, are theirs. And we urge all of growth to ſee that their conſciences anſwer to all Covenant, and Sacramental engagements; which in caſe it be done, will acquit them from putting any bar to any ſuch ſuppoſed work. As a man that takes a medicine, not underſtanding the worth of it, ſhall have equal benefit with him that moſt mightily extols it: ſo we, whether in Infancy or Age, notwithſtanding any ſuch ignorance ſhall reap this unexpected benefit by either of both of the Sacraments. Mr. *Hooker*, (who delivers himſelf in that manner touching the efficacy of Sacraments, that a man cannot tell on what part he ſtands) *lib.* 5. *Eccleſ. pol. Sect.* 57. ſaith, *It greatly offendeth, that ſome when they labour to ſhew the uſe of the holy Sacraments, aſſign unto them no end, but onely to teach the mind by other ſenſes, that which the Word doth teach by hearing. Whereupon how eaſily neglect and careleſſe regard of ſo heavenly myſteries may follow, we ſee in part by ſome experience had of thoſe men with whom that opinion is moſt ſtrong. For where the Word of God may be heard, which teacheth with much more expedition, and more full explication any thing we have to learn; if all the benefit we reap by Sacraments be inſtruction, they which at all times have opportunity of uſing the better means to that purpoſe, will ſurely hold the worſe in leſſe eſtimation.* To this I may well anſwer; 1. I know not who thoſe be, that have given offence that way; They at whom this learned Authour is apt to take exceptions, and moſt profeſſedly oppoſeth, do not limit the uſe of Sacraments within ſo narrow a compaſſe, as barely to teach the mind, or help the underſtanding, that is not, according to them, their whole work. As they are ſigns, they have a twofold other uſe. 1. As marks of diſtinction, to ſeparate Gods own from ſtrangers. 2. As bonds of obedience to God, ſtrict obligations to the mutual exerciſe of Chriſtian charity, provocations to godlineſſe, preſervations from ſin. The Authour himſelf layes down both of theſe; and I ſcarce think that in this, he hath ever been excepted againſt by any. As ſeales, they have a further work upon the will, for the ſtrengthening of our Faith, in aſſured confidence of the promiſes, as our Authour hath likewiſe obſerved. *In regard of the weakneſſe that is in us, they are warrants* (ſaith he) *for the more ſecurity of our belief.* 2. I ſay, they read the Scriptures with little heed, and it may be feared, as little benefit, that do not con-

conſcienciouſly make uſe of all thoſe helps, to which Scriptures lead; and that they lead to the uſe of Sacraments is evident. 3. If that the Word and Sacrament were two diſtinct teachers without reference one to the other, and it were left to my choyce which to take, I ſhould make uſe of the better, and leave the more inferiour. If I ſhould be neceſſitated to take the one, and leave the other, the Word ſhould be choſen. But ſeeing that the Sacraments are an appendant to the Word, given us in charge there, and the whole uſe of them by the Word is taught, no man can conſcienciouſly uſe the one, in neglect of the other. But let us ſee whether that which the Authour himſelf delivereth be not as much offenſive, as this at which he ſeems ſo greatly offended. Having laid down 3. ſeveral uſes of Sacraments, he addes, *But their chiefeſt force and vertue conſiſteth not herein ſo much, as that they are heavenly Ceremonies, which God hath ſanctified, and ordained to be adminiſtred in his Church, firſt as marks, whereby to know when God doth impart the vitall or ſaving grace of Chriſt unto all that are capable thereof; and ſecondly as meanes conditionall which God requireth in them unto whom he imparteth grace. For ſith God is in himſelf inviſible, and cannot by us be diſcerned working, therefore when it ſeemeth good in the eyes of his heavenly wiſdome, that men for ſome ſpeciall intent and purpoſe ſhould take notice of his glorious preſence, he giveth them ſome plain and ſenſible token whereby to know what they cannot ſee. For Moſes to ſee God and live was impoſſible, yet Moſes by fire, knew where the glory of God extraordinarily was preſent. The Angel by whom God indued the waters of the pool of Betheſda with ſupernatural vertue to heal, was not ſeen of any, yet the time of the Angels preſence known by the troubled motions of the waters themſelves. The Apoſtles by fiery tongues which they ſaw were admoniſhed, when the Spirit, which they could not behold, was upon them. In like manner it is with us: Chriſt and his holy Spirit, with all their bleſſed effects, though entring into the ſoul of man, we are not able to apprehend or expreſſe how, do notwithſtanding give notice of the times when they uſe to make their acceſſe, becauſe it pleaſed Almighty God to communicate by ſenſible means thoſe bleſſings which are incomprehenſible.* Who would not wiſh that theſe elegancies might univerſally hold, and that as ſure as *Moſes* knew that God was extraordinarily preſent in the burning buſh, and the diſeaſed in *Jeruſalem* knew that the Angel was preſent when the

waters were moved, and the Apostles that the Spirit was come down, when they saw the fiery cloven tongues; so in receiving of the Sacramental signes, we might as assuredly know, that vital, and saving grace is imparted to us, and that these sensible meanes do as assuredly communicate these incomprehensible blessings. But seeing those marks of distinction between the visible people of God, and those that are strangers to him, work no otherwise, as to vitall and saving grace, than hath been spoke, let us take heed lest these dissimilitudes do not draw us to imbrace a cloud instead of *Juno*, when it shall appear that they have not so much of elegancy, but are answered with equal incongruity. If they be such marks as these instances seem to hold out to us, how are they then conditional means to communicate these blessings? Upon what condition I marvel was it that *Moses* knew that God was in the bush? Or the Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, that the Angel was in the water? Or the Apostles, that the Spirit was come down upon them? These were undoubtedly to be lookt upon as unconditionate communications of the respective presence of God, his Angel, and his Spirit. And how this stands with that which presently after we find in our Authour, I know not, (unlesse many grains be allowed to abate the height of them) that *Sacraments are not Physical, but moral instruments of salvation, duties of service and worship, which unlesse we perform as the Authour of grace requireth, they are unprofitable. For all receive not the grace of God which receive the Sacraments of his grace.* *Moses* undoubtedly did enjoy the presence of the Angel, and the Apostles the presence of the Holy Ghost. Let us then learn to use them, as the Authour of grace requireth, and that is as signs and seales, as his chosen vessel to convey his grace here teaches.

I shall onely adde in this place. If Sacraments work as signes and seales, then they must be allowed to have that whole work on all that are Communicants, which as signes and seales they can possibly effect, either for the bettering of their understanding, or farther engagements in wayes of godlinesse, and that by the help of the Word, they may help the understanding even of unregenerate persons, and make discovery of strong engagements to wayes of godlinesse, can scarce be questioned. If the Word can teach the unregenerate by hearing, then the Sacraments being appointed for visible teaching-

signes,

signes, by the help of the Word may also teach them by seeing, and unregenerate men making profession of their relation to God, may here see further engagements and provocations to godlinesse. This effect cannot be denyed to be possible in Sacraments, as signs, at least upon some persons in unregeneration; and when they further see all the glorious priviledges of the Covenant, upon the terms propounded of God to be attainable, may they not be of singular use as seales to put them on, and stirre them up in all conscientious use of means to rise up to the answer of conscience? And so as the Word as an instrument in Gods hand, by instructions, motives, exhortations and other provocations is a means for conversion; so may the Sacraments as appendents to the Word, and by the help of it be herein serviceable likewise, which is the whole that I do or ever did attribute to Sacraments, so much as in a possible way, of conversion.

CHAP. XII. SECT. I.

The thing signified and sealed in Sacraments.

THe whole use and office of Sacraments we have seen, which is to seal the gift and grant of God in Covenant, as well as to signifie. The thing sealed in them here comes to be spoken to, which is the righteousnesse of faith. There being a double Covenant given of God to man, one in mans integrity, whilest he was in spiritual life, for preservation in life; the other in mans fallen condition when dead, for restitution to life. There is a double righteousnesse answering to this double Covenant: The one inherent in man, to be wrought by himself, and called our own righteousnesse; The other wrought by a Mediatour in our stead, and made ours by Faith, and therefore called the righteousnesse of faith, and sometimes the righteousnesse of God, being wrought by Christ who is God. And answerably to this double Covenant, and double righteousnesse, Sacraments of a double kind were instituted. The first without respect had to any Mediatour, confirming Gods engagements, on the terms of perfect obedience. The other with respect to a Mediatour, and Faith

Sacraments are suitable to Covenants.

Faith in him; confirming happineſſe to believers. The Sacraments of the Covenant of grace are of this latter ſort. They are ſigns and ſeales, as were the trees of life, and of the knowledge of good and evil, and ſeales of righteouſneſſe, as they were alſo, but of righteouſneſſe of another kind. The former were ſeales of the righteouſneſſe of works; Theſe are ſeales of the righteouſneſſe of faith. Thoſe were ſeales to aſſure a reward to our own righteouſneſſe; Theſe are ſeales to aſſure us of anothers righteouſneſſe, made ours by faith. From hence theſe two Obſervations follow; one implyed, the other in the words expreſt. The firſt which is implyed in the words, is,

The righteouſneſſe of Faith is the great Promiſe of the Covenant of Grace.

The Apoſtle tells us of blindneſſe that in part happened to *Iſrael*, Rom. 11.25. and the blindneſſe was this, that they would not be brought to an acknowledgment of this righteouſneſſe; But in an high zeal made it their buſineſſe to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſſe, *Rom.* 10. 2, 3. It do's not appear that they wholly denyed the concurrence of all grace for the work of this righteouſneſſe in which they confided. The Phariſee, who is brought in to perſonate thoſe of this opinion, ſaith, *God I thank thee, I am not like other men*; He therefore did acknowledge ſome kind of diſcriminating grace; But it was his own act, thorow grace, a righteouſneſſe inherent, and not through grace imputed; wrought by himſelf, and not by another in his ſtead, in which he confided. This obſervation might have been pertinently and properly ſpoken to, in this place, being that on which the Sacraments are bottomed; A flaw here muſt needs be the undoing of all. The Jew miſtaking here was at loſſe of all his pains, in ſacrifices, Sacraments and all other perſonal performances. When he had carried on this with the greateſt vigour, and alacrity; he was ſtill too ſhort, and this held him back that he look't not after any other righteouſneſſe, and ſo periſhed without any ſuch righteouſneſſe as was able to juſtifie. I ſhould not therefore have wholly paſt this by, but that a long expected and greatly deſir'd Treatiſe on this ſubject is ſent to the Preſſe, and will for a good ſpace of time prevent this piece, where the Reader, I doubt not, will find full ſatisfaction. I ſhall therefore wholly paſſe it by, and come to the Obſervation which the words expreſly hold out.

The

The righteousnesse of faith is sealed in the Sacraments of the Covenant of grace.

This enters we see the definition a Sacra-ment, and is expresselv laid down in the text of the Apostle, and for a right understanding of this great priviledge here sealed some Positions or explicatory Propositions must be laid down.

Propositions holding forth this righteousnesse.

Proposition 1

1. This is called the righteousnesse of faith (as before was hinted) in opposition to, and to distinguish it from the righteousnesse of works required in the Covenant, entered with man in his integrity; and which the Jewes for a great part conceited they were bound to answer acccording to the letter of the precepts of the Law, for the attainment of salvation. That of works is called by the name of *our righteousnesse*, Rom. 10.3. Phil. 3.18. being to be done by our selves, in our own persons; as also by the name of *the righteousnesse of the Law*, being required at our hands by the Law, so that salvation gained this way, is *of our selves*, *of works*, Ephes. 2.8,9. This other is called *the righteousnesse of faith* in this text, as also, *Phil.* 3.9. *Heb.* 11.7. Faith being the hand that receives it of Gods free gift, by grace; it is called also *the righteousnesse of God*, Rom. 10.3. Phil 3.9. Either as being the gift of God, which that phrase seems to imply, *the righteousnesse which is of God by faith*, or else as being the work of Christ, that is God. So that salvation this way gained is of grace, and the gift of God, *Ephes.* 2.8. These two are still opposed one to the other; when one is followed, the other is quit and left, *Rom.* 10.3. *They being ignorant of Gods righteousnesse and going about to establish their own righteousnesse, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousnesse of God*: so also, *Rom.* 10.5, 6. *Moses* describeth the righteousnesse which is of the Law, that *the man which doth these things shall live by them*: but the righteousnesse which is of faith speaketh on this wise, &c. *Phil.* 3.9. Not having mine own righteousnesse which is of the Law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousnesse which is of God by faith.

Propo. 2.

2. This righteousnesse is synechdochically put for the whole of the Covenant of grace that interests us in this righteousnesse, and so it must be taken in those words of the Apostle forequoted: *The righteousnesse which is of faith speaketh on this wise*, that is, the Covenant which interests us in the righteousnesse of faith,

speaketh

ſpeaketh this language; ſo that Sacraments ſealing this righteouſneſſe, they ſeal the whole of this Covenant.

Propoſ. 3. 3. All the bleſſings and priviledges following upon, and following from this Covenant unto true and full bleſſedneſſe, are here by the like figure comprized, as appears by the Apoſtles words, v.9. *Commeth this bleſſedneſſe then upon the circumciſion onely, or upon the uncircumciſion alſo? For we ſay that faith was reckoned to* Abraham *for righteouſneſſe.* This righteouſneſſe, and bleſſedneſſe, is made one and the ſame in thoſe words of the Apoſtle.

Propoſ. 4 4. Chriſt the Mediatour of the Covenant, that brings man into Covenant with God, is the fountain from whence all this bleſſedneſſe comes, in that by him this righteouſneſſe is wrought, ſo that he is the whole of all that good, that is comprized in the Covenant, and ſealed in the Sacraments This is plain in that of the Apoſtle, *Rom.*10.4. ſpeaking of the error of the Jewes, in going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſſe, and their non-ſubmiſſion of themſelves unto the righteouſneſſe of God; he ſaith, that *Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſſe to every one that believeth*, that is, *finis conſummans* (as *Gomarus* ſaith) not *conſumens*. The end at which the Law aimed, and not putting an end and period to it. One Chriſt aſſumes to himſelf; *It becometh us, to fulfil all righteouſneſſe*, Matth. 3.15. *The other he diſclaimes*, Matth.5.17. *Think not that I am come to deſtroy the Law or the Prophets: I am not come to deſtroy, but to fulfil.* The Law calls us to righteouſneſſe, but is not able to work it in us: Chriſt hath done it for us, and in our ſtead. He is therefore called *our righteouſneſſe*, 1 Cor.1.30. *Jehovah our righteouſneſſe*, Jer.23.6. ſo that whereſoever we prove that Chriſt is ſealed to us, in the Sacrament, or any other benefit flowing from Chriſt as Mediatour, there is a ſufficient proof of this obſervation.

Propoſ. 5. 5. Faith is here conſidered, as an inſtrument receiving this righteouſneſſe, and intereſting us in this Covenant-promiſe. They that will not allow that faith ſhould be called an inſtrument of juſtification, yet are not much troubled that it ſhould be called an inſtrument that receives Chriſt, that doth juſtifie. And if either may be allowed, (as I do not doubt but that both will hold current) this will hold, that faith is conſidered here as an inſtrument, and not as a work, neither yet as an inſtrument of the

the soul, producing any act beyond it self, as the hand is the instrument to the soul in labour, but as receiving, and taking in a gift from God. This the Phrase of the Apostle, *Phil.* 3.9. doth clear. *The righteousness of God by faith*; otherwise it might be stiled the righteousnesse of works; yea, when the words are the righteousnesse of faith, the meaning must still be, the righteousnesse of works; as a man when he receives pay for threshing or digging, receives pay for working. But these are made directly opposite one to the other, and not confounded one with the other, *Rom.* 10.5,6. Faith therefore is considerednot as a work or habitual grace in the soul: So considered it is a branch of our own righteousnesse; but as an instrumeut applying Christ, and interesting us in his righteousnesse.

The Point proved.

These Positions being premised, the Observation may be easily proved, that the righteousnesse of faith, or the righteousnesse of God by faith, is sealed in the Sacraments of the Covenant of grace, and may be made good in an induction of particulars. Circumcision, the leading Sacrament of the old Covenant is expresly here spoken to, and here we see what is the thing signified in it, and sealed by it. And in case we saw no more in it, then the most carnal amongst the Jewes saw, that it was a note of distinction between them, and others that had no visible relation to God in Covenant, yet we know that this distinction was grounded and founded in Christ. The one stood in a visible relation to him, and the other were strangers from him. And the Apostle, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. is full in the proof of it. Having said, that we are compleat in Christ, enjoying him we want nothing, it might be objected, that we want the very leading Ordinance which receives a people into visible Communion with God, which was Circumcision; The Apostle answers, *that in him we are circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ.* This, Circumcision did figure, *Deut.* 30.6. *Jer.* 9.26. *Rom.* 2.28, 29. And this is the work of Christ, as we see in the Apostles words, and therefore circumcision led to him.

By Scriptures.

For the following Sacrament of the Passeover, if we look to the letter of the institution, together with the explication given, we shall find it a memorial of a temporal mercy. *It is the Lords Passeover*, Exod. 12. 11. that is, a memorial that the Lord passed

over them when he ſmote the Land of *Egypt*, v. 13. But this is no concluding Argument, that it ſealed not Chriſt, or the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt by faith, as may (God willing) be made to appear when we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of the Cloud, that guided *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*, the Sea that they paſſed through, and Manna and the rock whereof they ate and drank. This deliverance celebrated in the Paſſeover was in and through Chriſt, as is gathered from the blood that was to be ſtruck on the two ſide-poſts, and on the upper door-poſt of their houſes, *Exod.* 12. 7. But moſt clearly from the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 10. 9. He there ſayes *they tempted Chriſt*; but they tempted him, from whom they had defence, and preſent deliverance: And therefore the Apoſtle expreſly calls the Paſchal Lamb by the Name of Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 5. 7. *For even Chriſt our Paſſeover is ſacrificed for us.* And *John Baptiſt* had reſpect to it as well as to other Sacrifices of the Law, when pointing out Chriſt, he ſaid, *Behold, the Lamb of God which taketh away the ſins of the world*, Joh. 1. 29. This is ſo clear in the Sacraments of the New Teſtament, Baptiſme and the Supper of the Lord, that proofs do not need.

By Reaſons.

And the Reaſons of it are clear.

Reaſon 1.

Firſt, Sacraments are for power againſt ſin, and pardon of ſin, as appears by thoſe frequent Texts produced for the working power of Sacraments, which need not to be repeated; But by Chriſt we have power againſt ſin, *Without him we can do nothing*, Joh. 15. 5. *We can do all things through Chriſt that ſtrengtheneth*, Phil. 4. 13. In him we have the Circumciſion made without hands, *which is the putting away the body of the ſins of the fleſh*, Col. 2. 11. By Chriſt we have pardon of ſin, *God hath ſet him forth a propitiation through faith in his blood*, Rom. 3. 25. *The blood of Chriſt cleanſeth from all ſin*, 1 Joh. 1. 7. Chriſt then is ſignified and ſealed in the Sacraments.

Reaſon 2.

Secondly, Sacraments are for ſalvation, that is their end, in common with all other Church-Ordinances whatſoever. *Baptiſme ſaves*, 1 Pet. 3. 21. But ſalvation is through Chriſt, *He is the Authour of eternal ſalvation*, Heb. 5. 9. *Neither is there ſalvation in any other: for there is none other Name under heaven given among men, whereby we muſt be ſaved.*

Reaſon 3.

Thirdly, Sacraments lead to the Covenant, and confirm by way of ſeal, all whatſoever that there in word, is made over. This is done in all ſeals which ſerve for ratification of grants.

When

When you see a seal you must find the use and latitude of it in the Covenant, so it is in Sacramental seals, God entering Covenant with *Abraham* to be his God, and the God of his seed, which was a Covenant for true blessedness, *Matth.* 22. 31, 32. Circumcision was instituted for confirmation of it, and put (as we see in the Text) as a seal to it. When Christ had promised his flesh for meat, and his blood for drink, being to leave the world, he instituted signs for memorial which are seals of it: With this explanation or comment of his own upon them, This is my body which is given for you, this Cup is the New Testament in my blood. And that Christ is the great Promise for blessedness in the Covenant, and that in him all Covenant-promises are made good, needs not to be proved. Christ therefore is sealed in the Sacraments.

The doctrine by rules explained. *Rule* 1.

1. This we are so to understand, that as all happiness and true blessedness is comprized under the righteousness of Faith, (even all that the Apostle looked after and made his ambition to compasse in lieu of all those priviledges, which he once had made, and false teachers his adversaries still did make matter of their glory, *Phil.* 3. 8, 9.) so every Sacrament, that is a seal of this righteousness of faith, seales all whatsoever is given of God in Covenant to his people. If there be thousands of things made over in any grant, one seal is the confirmation of all; and though the seales be many, (as *Amesius* observes) yet all that is passed in Covenant is made good in each. Our Justification, Adoption, Perseverance, Glorification, and whatsoever else in order to these or any of these, a people upright in Covenant may expect from the hand of God, is under seal, in every Sacrament confirm'd unto them. So that, whatsoever it is that the Word promiseth, that the Sacraments by way of seal ratifie and confirm unto us. *Abraham* had this righteousness of Faith revealed to him by promise, the Gospel being preached to him, *Gal.* 3. 8. He had also the Land of *Canaan* given in promise as a special gift to his posteriry; This was now confirm'd also to him in his Circumcision. The righteousness of faith was, as the marrow and substance of the gift, and therefore the Apostle puts it into his definition: yet the gift of the Land of *Canaan*, which was onely an adjunct annexed (as *Chamier* observes) is confirmed with it. Every baptized man hath the righteousness of Faith in Promise, and ratified to him in Baptisme, and whatsoever else is

made over in promiſe by reaſon of any ſpecial calling or relation which is of God, is confirm'd in Baptiſme likewiſe. When we are put of God into any way, we have his promiſe, *Pſal.* 91. 11. to be kept in that way. This promiſe is aſſured and confirmed in Baptiſme, Miniſters are called of God, and commiſſioned for their work, in which we know they have many and large promiſes; all of theſe in their Baptiſme are confirmed to them.

Rule 2. 2. Sacraments ſeal theſe bleſſings not onely univerſally, and in the bulk, but with particular application, to every one that doth partake of them. The Word holding this out indefinitely unto us, *that he that hath the Son hath life*, and that *unto whom God gives his Son, with him he gives all things*; that, *eating the fleſh, and drinking the blood of Chriſt*, believers have eternal life: here a particular tender is made of his body and blood in theſe viſible Elements of water, and of bread and wine. The water is paſſively received in Baptiſme, the bread and wine actually taken, eaten and drunk in the Lords Supper. In either whole Chriſt, and the whole of all the benefits of Chriſt is tendred and to be received. So that what miracles extraordinarily were to particular promiſes, as we read in Scriptures, for the confirmation of thoſe that beheld them, and for whoſe ſake they were wrought; that Sacraments ordinarily are, and ſerve for, as to true bliſſe and eternal happineſſe. This *Bellarmine*, lib. 1. de Sacram. in gen. cap. 24. charges on his adverſaries, quoting *Melanction* and *Luther* for it, and we are content willingly to own it; and among many others which he charges as errours, he ſayes this is the chief, and diligently to be refuted: therefore he ſets himſelf profeſſedly againſt this uſe of Sacraments, and will not have them to ſerve by way of ſeal for confirmation of our faith in particular. And this he endeavours with five ſeveral Arguments.

SECT.

SECT. II.

Objections against the former doctrine.

1. *IF Sacraments confirm our faith by way of seal or after the manner of miracles, then Sacraments must be better known, and more efficacious to perswade to Faith, than the Word; But nothing can be more efficacious for perswasion than the Word of God: and experience tells us, that words are better understood than dumb signes, and Sacraments compared to the Word are as dumb signes.* *Object.* 1.

Answ. 1. The assumption here should have been, *Nothing is either more easily known, or more eminently efficacious than the Word.* But the former is left out, lest it should give check to their doctrine of obscurity of Scriptures; and instead of making the Word easily intelligible, he contents himself to say, that it is more intelligible than nods or dumb shews, when yet dumb signs or such nods are better known, and more easily understood, (as we have experience sufficient) than the Word of God, or any other word whatsoever, in an unknown language. *Answ.* 1.

2. If this Argument be of force, then nothing else in the world but the bare Word of promise revealed in Scripture, is any way serviceable, for more full assurance of the thing given in promise: Not onely *Gideons*, *Ezekiah's* and *Ahaz* his signs, but the oath also made to *Abraham*, was superfluous. All these had the Word of God, and unlesse the signs given them, and the oath made to them, were more efficacious then the Word, (which, as he sayes, nothing is) according to him they are all superfluous. 2.

3. Comparison is not to be made between the Word, and Sacraments, whether of those considered apart, is more efficacious. Then the preheminence is to be given to the Word, as *Bellarmine* sayes *Luther acknowledgeth*: but enquiry is to be made whether the Word together with Sacraments, annext to it, be not more efficacious by reason of our weakness and inclinations to diffidence, than the Word without any such visible ratification. Nothing can be more firm than the promise of God, seeing *God cannot lye*, Tit. 1. 2. His Oath is no more valid then 3.

then his Word, yet *God willing more abundantly to shew unto the heires of promise, the immutability of his counsel, confirm'd it by an oath, That by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lye, we might have strong consolation.*

Object. 2. 2. *The nature of Sacraments cannot any where be better understood, than from his words that is the authour of them; But in the Holy Scriptures they are no where called seales of Promises, but instruments of Justification*: Ergo.

Answ. 1. Answ. 1. If this Propositon stand, then some at least of the Sacraments of *Rome*, and most of their Sacramentals must fall, seeing, by *Thomas Aquinas* his acknowledgment they are not to be found in Scriptures.

2. 2. There is nothing more false then this assumption, as abundantly hath been declared, and the Text in hand is a sufficient witnesse.

Ob. 3. 3. *If Sacraments be onely seales of the promise of grace, then either they are superfluous, or else of very slender use and benefit, for we have more Testimonies far more efficacious. Good works are better signes and testimonies of righteousnesse obtained, then washing with water, or taking of the Eucharist, which may be received Hypocritically.*

Answ. 1. Answ. 1. If this Argument be of any force, then whereſoever there is one witnesse, to speak in any cause, all the other are vain and superfluous; and so that of the Apostle will fall to the ground, *At the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established.*

2. 2. It is well that works are made a witnesse of assurance, then this way at least assurance may be had, which he and his party are wont to deny.

3. 3. Works are not Testimonies instituted of God for this end, (as *Amesius* observes) but of their own nature, they evidence our fitnesse for glory, and as fruits of our faith, as *Whitaker* speaks. And those which *Bellarmine* uses to make the best of works, *Almes, Fasting and Prayer*, may be hypocritically performed likewise.

4. 4. This witnesse or seal of Sacraments is not a distinct witnesse or seal from that which the Jesuit here produces, but stands in co-ordination with it, or rather in subordination to it. It is upon the answer of a good conscience, not otherwise, that Sacraments give this witnesse.

4. *If*

4. *If Sacraments seal by way of particular application for support of Faith, then it is in vain to baptize Infants; But Lutherans are wholly for Infant-baptisme.* Object. 4.

Ans. 1. We may learn of *Bellarmine*, that Protestants at least think that this doctrine, and Infant-baptisme, will well stand together. Answ. 1.

2. The Apostle was certainly able to have given a satisfying answer to this Objection, seeing he tells us, that Circumcision was a seal of the righteousnesse of Faith, and yet himself was circumcised the eighth day, *Phil.* 3. 5. It is of equal strength against Infant-circumcision as against baptisme. 2.

5. *If Sacraments be seales of grace which in particular is conferred upon any, then oftentimes they are false, viz. when the Sacrament is given to a man, who pretends to believe, and indeed doth not believe; and so it were unlawful to baptize any, lest we should cause God to give witnesse to a lye, for we certainly know of none, whether they believe truly, or onely pretend it.* Obj. 5.

Ans. Our Adversary here prevents us, and puts an answer into our mouthes. Perhaps, saith he, they will say, *That the Sacrament is a seal or testimony of grace, not absolutely, but, if he that doth receive the Sacrament, do believe the promise.* And this indeed is their Answer, as out of *Ametius*, *Whitaker*, *Vorstius*, *Parens*, Dr. *Reynolds*, Mr. *Rutherford* I have shewn; to which may be added, that full Testimony out of Dr. *Slater* before mentioned. As for those that will have the Covenant to be absolute, and the seales to be put without any respect had to any condition: against the full stream of Protestant Writers, I shall desire them to help us to any other satisfying answer to this Argument. I must confesse, that in case I be once convinced, that the work of Sacraments is to ratifie Gods promise in an absolute way, as the Rainbowe do's, that God will no more destroy the World by water, without respect had to any condition at all. And that a seal is put to a blank, in case any unregenerate person be baptized or admitted to the Lords Table; I must either be holpen with further light, than I can yet see, or else I think I shall never more adventure upon Baptisme, or the Lords Supper. And *Bellarmine* supposing that this will be our answer, can bring nothing more to avoid it then two speeches of *Luther*, and one of *Melanctin*, nothing at all to purpose. Answ.

SECT.

SECT. III.

A Corollary from the former Doctrine.

Circumcision no carnall badge.

THen it followes by way of neceſſary Corollary, that Circumciſion is no carnal badge, but a ſeal of ſpiritual mercies given in promiſe. The righteouſneſſe of faith is no carnal, but a ſpiritual priviledge. Circumciſion is a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith, and therefore it is no carnal badge, but a ſeal of ſpiritual mercies. This might here fitly be enlarged to take off this ſhift which Anabaptiſts have borrowed from Jeſuites; But this is already done at large, Treatiſe of the Covenant, Chap. 26. And here nothing needs to be added.

SECT. IV.

A further Corollary from the Doctrine.

Sacraments in the time of the Law and dayes of the Goſpel are of the ſame uſe and ſignification.

IT further followes, that Sacraments in the time of the Law, and in the dayes of the Goſpel were of the ſame uſe and ſignification: the Sacraments of Iſraelites and Chriſtians are all one in ſubſtance. This is clear. Circumciſion was a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith; and in caſe, Sacraments in the dayes of the Goſpel ſeal not this to Chriſtians, we muſt then leave the Apoſtles, and ſeek a new way of happineſſe. Yea, if then there were any Sacrament properly ſo called, (as ſome argue) that Sacrament muſt neceſſarily be of the ſame, and no other uſe and ſignification than theſe, which followed after in the time of the Law, and dayes of the Goſpel, ſeeing thoſe Fathers were under the ſame promiſe of the righteouſneſſe of faith, That was *Noah's* inheritance, *Heb.* 11. 7. This further appears from the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2, 3. *I would not that ye ſhould be ignorant, how that all our Fathers were under the cloud, and all paſſed through the Sea: and were all baptized unto Moſes in the cloud, and in the Sea. And did all eat the ſame ſpiritual meat, and did all drink the ſame ſpiritual drink: for they drank of the Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt.* The Apoſtle here firſt

1 Cor. 10. 1, 2, 3. opened.

gives

gives the very name of our leading Sacrament unto theirs; they were all baptized unto *Moses* (saith he) in the Cloud & in the Sea. 2dly, he declares that the thing signified was the same in theirs, as it is in our Sacraments. They ate the same spiritual meat, and they drank the same spiritual drink, and so from hence this Argument is obvious. Where there is the same name, and the same thing, there is the same Ordinance in substance; But here is the same name and the same thing (as we have seen); and therefore the Ordinances are in substance the same. *The Apostle gives no greater excellency* (saith *Calvin*) *to our Sacraments then to theirs, when he saith, that the fathers ate the same spiritual meat with us, interpreting himself, that that meat is Christ.* *Bellarmine* here finds severall difficulties (as he calls them) seemingly making for us against him, and presses them further then he can find strength to answer. 1. If the Jewes ate the same spiritual meat, and drank the same spiritual drink as we do in the Lords Supper, then there was the same vertue in Manna as in the Lords Supper. To this he answers; that they all ate of the same meat one as others among themselves, but not the same with that which we eat. But, I had rather follow the Apostles own Comment then *Bellarmines*: and he interprets this meat to be Christ: and unless we feed not on Christ, we and they have the same spiritual food. For, as the Apostle tells us, they fed on him. 2. If it were spiritual meat, spiritual drink, wherewith they were fed, it had the same efficacy as our Sacraments. Ours have no efficacy above that which is spiritual. 3. He saith, we urge the state of the question which the Apostle there handles. The Apostle there warns Christians not to rest too much in their fruition of Sacraments, so as to think themselves safe, because they were baptized and admitted to the Lords Supper, seeing Sacraments like to these, little availed the fathers that did not abstain from sin. And lastly, *Austin* is produced on our behalf, who, Tractate on *Joh.* 16. saith, That the Sacraments of the Jewes and ours were different in their signes, but the same in the thing signified. They were different in outward visible appearance, but the same in their divine vertue. These he makes it his businesse to answer, lib. 2. *de effectu Sacram.* cap. 17. Which answers of his are so fully taken off, by *Amesius*, *Bellar. enervat.* tom. 3. cap. 4. And by *Whitaker*, *prælect. de Sacram.* Quæst. 5. cap. 3. that I need not cause this work to swell any bigger with it. And this Text, I doubt not, is clear for it.

Col. 2. 11, 12. The Apostle makes Circumcision, and Baptisme one and the same, and calls Circumcision by the name of Baptisme, Circumcision of the heart (which is the putting away the body of the sins of the flesh) was signified (and in the right use of it effected) in circumcision, *Deut.* 10. 16. *Jer.* 4. 4. *Rom.* 2. 28. And the same is signified, and in the right use of it effected in Baptisme, as appears in the text quoted, as also, *Rom.* 6. 4. *We are buried with him by Baptisme into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newnesse of life.* This also appears in reason.

Reasons assigned.

Reas. 1. 1. Sacraments have their esteem and excellency, according to promises. They have no efficacy, or excellency in themselves; but as they relate to promises: but the Fathers were under equal promises with us, they were under the same promises as we may see, *Gen.* 17. 7. I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting Covenant to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee. And the Apostle, *Heb.* 11. 16. speaking of the Fathers, saith, God is not ashamed to be called their God. This promise is interpreted by Christ to include mercies for eternity, *Matt.* 22. 31, 32. Temporal promises will not evince a resurrection: But these promises, as Christ lets us know, do evince it. Gospell promises are the greatest: but they enjoyed Gospel-promises, *Gal.* 3. 8. *Heb.* 4. 2. They were therefore our equalls in promises.

Reas. 2. 2. Children of the same father, are fed at his table, with the same food; at least so farre the same, as to work to the same life: But they were children of the same Father, *Rom.* 9. 4. *To them pertained the adoption*: Ergo.

Reas. 3. 3. Subjects of the same kingdome enjoy the same ordinances: But they are subjects of the same Kingdome, *Matth.* 8. 11. I say unto you that many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob* in the Kingdome of heaven. The same Kingdome in which *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* were, Gentiles that are called in Gospel-times are: *Ergo.*

Explicatory Rules.

Rule. 1. This we must understand with these rules.

First, These Sacraments, theirs and ours, are not in that manner one; but that there are many circumstantial differences between

tween them. 1. They differ in their outward ſignes; appearing to us, in ſeveral ſhapes. That which was ſeen in Circumciſion, differed much from water in Baptiſme; and a Lamb, whether of the herd or flock, differs much from bread and wine. 2. Ours are of greater eaſe then theirs. There was pain and ſmart in Circumciſion; which the new Circumciſed *Shechemites* felt to their coſt, *Gen.* 34. 25. which happily might occaſion the neglect of circumciſion of *Moſes* his ſonne, through the Mothers tenderneſſe, as may be gathered from her words, *Exod.* 4. 25. Neither was the Paſſeover without coſt and pains; eſpecially to them that lived at a great diſtance from *Jeruſalem*. 3. There is farre more light accompanying our Sacraments then theirs, not in themſelves; for as much might be gathered, if not more, for ſignificancy from their outward ſigns, then from ours; but by reaſon of the clear diſcovery of the promiſes, and open, full maniſeſtation of their uſe. 4. Ours were without blood, theirs were accompanied with blood, one of the perſon receiving, the other in the ſign received. 5. Old Teſtament-Sacraments had their period, and others follow in their place: Ours muſt not ceaſe until all time ceaſeth, Baptiſme muſt hold *to the end of the world*, Matth. 28. 20. And the Lords Supper *until Chriſt come*, 1 Cor. 11. 26. But none of theſe make any ſubſtantial difference, nor any more then that which is circumſtantial, or gradual; The outward dreſſe in which they differently appear, can make no difference in ſubſtance. A ſeal is one and the ſame, whether the wax be red, green, or yellow, yea, whether the impreſſion be in wax, or dough, whether the ſignet have the Letters of a mans name, or the Arms that he gives. Men look at the grant to which the ſeal is put, and not at theſe circumſtances. Neither matters it whether they be done with trouble or eaſe, and where their worth is not known, they are not therefore in themſelves of leſſe value. And though they do not endure alwaies, their efficacy is yet no leſſe, whileſt they laſt. If we eye circumſtances of this nature, ours may be advanced; But if we eye the ſubſtantial work, theirs will be equal. Hereupon ſo different ſpeeches are quoted from *Auſtins* pen; Some highly advancing our Sacraments above theirs, and others parallelling theirs with ours, which with this diſtinction may be fairly reconciled, and (as we have heard) the author himſelf thus reconciles them.

Secondly, Thoſe undervaluing phraſes of Old Teſtament-Sa- *Rule 2.*

craments, which are ſometimes found in the Prophets and Apoſtles, and brought by adverſaries to put them at a great diſtance behind ours, are either ſpoken, as they were abuſed and miſobſerved by Jews in unbelief, and impenitence, and not according to their inſtitution, or lawful uſe; in which caſe we might ſay the ſame of Baptiſme or the Lords Supper. Or elſe we muſt underſtand them, as having an end by Chriſts coming in the fleſh put to them, and ſo in their uſe dead, if not deadly to the obſervers.

Rule 3. Thirdly, Though *Bellarmine* makes it one of the particulars, wherein we and they agree, that the Sacraments of the Jewes are types of ours, in the daies of the Goſpel; Yet in caſe the word *type* be taken in that ſenſe, as it is ordinarily uſed, we utterly diſclaim it. There are indeed very many, and different acceptations of this word, as may appear to any that will conſult *John* 21. 25. *Act.* 23. 25. *Act.* 7. 43. *Rom.* 6. 17. *Rom.* 5. 14. with *Heb.* 9. 24. *Phil.* 3. 17. *Act.* 7. 44. 1 *Cor.* 10. 6. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. And, as it is uſed in that one place in *Peter*, where Baptiſme is ſaid to be the antitype to the Ark (which according to Interpreters implyes onely a ſimilitude, or correſpondence) we may well grant that their Sacraments were *types*, that is, theirs and ours carry a full reſemblance; but taking the word as it is ordinarily uſed, for that which ſhadowes out, ſomewhat that is to come, by Divine inſtitution, whether perſon or thing; as *Adam*, Rom. 5. 14. is ſaid to be a type, *or figure of him that was to come*; and the holy places made with hands, are types *and figures of the true*, which doubtleſſe our adverſaries intend, ſo it is to be denied; and Proteſtant Writers unanimouſly deny them to be any ſuch types, wholly diſclaiming that doctrine, that the Sacraments of the Jews did onely ſhadow out grace, and ours do conferre it. And therefore when the contents affixed to the reſpective Chapters in our laſt tranſlation, ſeem otherwiſe ſingularly exact, ſo that that great Critick, *Ainſworth* (who cannot be ſuſpected to do it out of any humor of imitation) in his tranſlation of the *Pentateuch* and the *Pſalms*, very rarely differs from them, it is wonder how that ſlip came into the contents affixed to 1 *Cor.* 10. thus expreſt, 1. *The Sacraments of the Jewes*, 6. *are types of ours*, 7. *and their puniſhments*, 11. *enſamples for us*, when it ſhould rather have been 1. *The Sacraments of the Jewes are the ſame with ours*, 5. *their puniſhments are enſamples for us*. The four firſt verſes making the Sacraments there mentioned to be of the ſame uſe with ours,

and

and the seven following verses to v. 12. shew that their sufferings for sin, are our examples for admonition, that we run not upon like practices. See *Ravanellus in verbum Typus*, *Whitaker* prælect. de Sacram. quæst. 5. cap. 1. pag. 109. *Parens* in 1 *Cor.* 10. 6.

SECT. V

A third Corollary from the doctrine.

All must see that they be rightly principled in the doctrine of this righteousnesse.

THen it followes by way of necessary Corollary, that Christians should see, that they be rightly principled in this doctrine of the righteousnesse of faith, as that in which the great mercy of the new Covenant, and all that the Sacraments seal is comprized. Ignorance of this, being the undoing of the zealous Jew, A mistake or flaw here must needs be of singular danger. And here those of the Church of *Rome* may be supposed to be most of all secure, seeing there is no imaginable righteousnesse, but they hedge it in: as may appear in a brief view of their doctrine. That righteousnesse which must save, either must be wrought by our selves, and so stiled our righteousnesse; or else it must be wrought by an other, and made ours. There is no righteousnesse of a third sort. That which is wrought by our selves, is either according to the command of God, prescribed in the law, or else over, above, and besides the Law, assumed by our selves, or received by tradition. As Pharisees had an high zeal for both of these, whereof *Paul* in his unconversion is an instance, *Phil.* 3. 6. *Gal.* 1. 14. So it is at least pretended by these persons, though their zeal for their righteousnesse of the law, falls farre short of that for the tradition of the Church. And for righteousnesse, besides their own, wrought by others, they take in not onely the righteousnesse of Christ; but also the supererogation of the Saints; which, as they perswade themselves, is satisfactory, not onely for the Saints themselves, but for others. The Church of *Rome* makes it her care to take in the whole of all these branches of righteousnesse, and in all of them they place their justification. Here we had need of the clew of Scriptures to lead us. That righteousnesse which according to the precept of

of the Law, is to be wrought by our selves, as to sanctification or qualification of the soul in the way of salvation; we must vigorously pursue and not disclaim. As Christ when he was accused by the Pharisees to destroy the law, and to be an enemy to righteousnesse; to take off this calumny, he tells his Disciples, *Matth.* 5. 20. *I say unto you, that except your righteousnesse, shall exceed the righteousnesse of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdome of Heaven.* So we may say to these adversaries that charge us to be enemies of good works, except your righteousnesse exceed the righteousnesse of these superstitious ones, ye can by no means enter into the Kingdome of heaven. The righteousnesse of a Papist being of the self same stamp with that of the Pharisees, for tradition the *Trent* Councel makes known their zeal, Concil. Triden. Sess. quart. p. 11. *With the same degree of reverence, and esteem we receive the Traditions of our Fathers, as we do the bookes of the Old and New Testament;* and how defective both of them were touching the righteousnesse of the law, their agreement in the glosse which they put upon the law is a sufficient witnesse. The Pharisees glosse on the law we may read in Christs refutation, *Matth.* 5. and the several precepts, which Christ there delivers, transcending the Pharisees dictates, Papists will have to be no branches of the law, but Evangelical Counsels added to it; So that B. *Hall* quotes a speech of *Serrarius* the Jesuite that the Pharisees may not unfitly be compared to Catholiques, adding as his own, *that one egge is not liker to an other, then the Tridentine Fathers to these Jesuites.* Supererogating righteousnesse, and that which is bottom'd on tradition, we must wholly shun. It is enough that we can bring it up to the rule, in the parts of it, it must not exceed. It is hard to determine whether a man that casts off all regard of righteousnesse, or a man of such righteousnesse, be more hatefull in Gods presence; one utterly sleights the soveraignty of God, and the other corrects his wisdome; one refuses to serve at all, the other serves onely, according to his own pleasure. As to the other branch of righteousnesse wrought by others, The supposed satisfaction of the Saints must be left, and the Lord Christs alone chosen. That speech of Christ in the Prophet *Isai.* 63. 3. spoken of the conquest of his enemies, *I have trod the Wine-presse alone, and of the people there were none with me,* holds true, when it is applied (as by many it hath been, though not according to the

letter

letter of the text) to his satisfaction, *By one offering he hath perfected for ever those that are sanctified*, Heb. 10. 14. yea, the righteousnesse of Christ, in the matter of justification must stand alone, in opposition to all righteousnesse in the world, whether of others, imaginarily to be applyed, out of any publique treasury, by way of indulgence; or wrought by our selves, either by the strength of natural abilities without grace, (which the Papists confesse to be too weak) or in grace, and these works (how great an honour soever of late is put upon them) come short of perfection to justification likewise, as plainly appears by the Apostles argumentation, *Rom.* 3. 20. *By the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight*, giving this in for his reason, *for by the Law is the knowledg of sin.* The argument runs thus, Where the Law discovers sin, the works commanded by it cannot justifie; This proposition is the Apostles: But the law discovers sinne, even in those in whom grace here hath its most perfect work; This needs not to be proved: Therefore works commanded in the law, and done by assistance of grace in the regenerate cannot justifie. And that the Apostle disclaims all righteousnesse any other way his own, then by free imputation from God in the work of justification, is clear, 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. *I know nothing by my self, yet am I not hereby justified.* Though he had the witnesse of a good conscience, as his rejoycing, 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. Yet this is not his justification, when the Rhemists on the place, and *Bellarmine* de justificat. urge this text against assurance of salvation, Mr. *Ball*, Treat. of Faith. pag. 107. saith, *This text makes strongly against justification by works, but against certainty of salvation it makes nothing.* And *Pareus* upon the words saith, *Hence it is most firmly concluded that by the works of the law no man is justified.* If so great an Apostle cannot be justified by works, then much lesse others. His works were certainly done by the power of grace, and upon new-Covenant-engagements. That of Mr. *Baxter*, Aphor. of justif. pag. 307. must stand as an eternal truth; who after that he had laid down the Socinians tenent, that they acknowledg not that Christ hath satisfied the Law for us, and consequently is none of our legal righteousnesse, but onely hath set us a coppy to write after, and is become our pattern, and that we are justified by following him, as a captain and guide to heaven and so all our proper righteousnesse is in this obedience; And having mark'd it with this just brand, [*Most cursed doctrine*] he addes

addes, *So far am I from this, that I ſay, The righteouſneſſe which we muſt plead againſt the lawes accuſations, is not one grain of it in our faith or works, but all out of us in Chriſts ſatisfaction.*

Faith the alone grace that intereſts us in this righteouſneſſe.

As this righteouſneſſe which is no otherwiſe ours, but by imputation (being neither inherent in us, nor wrought by us) muſt ſtand entire, and ſole in our juſtification: ſo faith muſt be acknowledged to be the alone grace which intereſts us in it, and attains to our reconciliation to God in Chriſt, otherwiſe why is it that not onely the denomination is ſtill from faith onely? (as we ſee in the text, and alwaies when it is named, it is called the righteouſneſſe of faith, and not of hope, love, obedience, or repentance) But that juſtification is evermore in Scripture aſcribed to this grace? The Apoſtle ſpeaking of Chriſt who is confeſſed to be our righteouſneſſe, ſaith, Whom God hath ſet forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. In him, God, who otherwiſe through wrath ſtands at the greateſt diſtance, is propitious, and this through Faith; on which *Diodate* hath theſe words, *All this hath been done by vertue of Gods appointment, who of his meer will, and full power, hath from everlaſting appointed Chriſt to be the onely means of expiation and reconciliation, applyable to man by faith, which is the means, or inſtrument whereby we receive the mercy of God.* So alſo, *Gal.* 2. 16. is very full, *Knowing that a man is not juſtified by the works of the Law, but by faith in Chriſt Jeſus.* The Apoſtle there firſt in the negative ſhewes, where our juſtification is not, and in the next place tells us, in the affirmative where it is; ſo that all works of all kinds, are by him excluded, and faith onely is acknowledged. Whereas one ſaith, that *Paul doth either in expreſſe words, or in the ſenſe and ſcope of his ſpeech, exclude onely the works of the Law, that is, the fulfilling of the condition of the Law our ſelves, but never the fulfilling of the Goſpel-conditions*, that we may have part in Chriſt; It is fully againſt the Apoſtle, if by fulfilling the Goſpel-condition any thing but faith be underſtood. All works are excluded, and faith as in oppoſition to works is acknowledged, and we have our part or intereſt in Chriſt, in or by fulfilling of no other Goſpel-condition, then that of faith, whereby we receive Chriſt, and Chriſt dwells in us, *John* 1. 12. *Eph.* 3. 17. The ſame Authour teaches us to *diſtinguiſh betwixt our firſt poſſeſſion of Juſtification (which is upon our contract with Chriſt, or meer faith) and*

the

the confirmation, continuation and accompliſhment of it, whoſe condition is alſo ſincere obedience and perſeverance. But being firſt poſſeſt of juſtification, we are juſtified, and of this *Paul* ſtill ſpeaks, and there is no interciſion of it, nor any other way in progreſſe of time to be intereſted in it. Being juſtified we enter upon a reconciled ſtate, which is never loſt, and held up onely by Chriſt upon the intereſt of our faith. Obedience and Perſeverance are both of neceſſity to obtain the end of our Faith, the ſalvation of our ſoules, but not to give us this intereſt in Chriſt. Sin in the elect-regenerate, may work a man (as hath been ſaid) under preſent wrath, but renders him not a child of wrath; brings upon him an inaptitude for glory, but makes him not ſimply liable to condemnation for eternity. This accompliſhment of Juſtification in the ſenſe ſpoken to, is no other then glorification; and theſe two are diſtinct links in *Paul's* golden chain (as it is called) *Rom.* 8. 30. *Whom he did predeſtinate, them alſo he called; and whom he called, them alſo he juſtified; and whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified.* As Predeſtination differs from vocation, and juſtification; ſo Juſtification alſo from glorification; when our firſt poſſeſſion of Juſtification is acknowledged to be of meer faith, *Paul's* juſtification is confeſſed to be of meer faith likewiſe. The ſame Authour ſaith, *Paul doth by the word* [*faith*] *eſpecially direct your thoughts to Chriſt believed in: for to be juſtified by Chriſt, and to be juſtified by receiving Chriſt is with him all one*; and I am ſure faith alone receives Chriſt, and no Evangelical work either of obedience or perſeverance; therefore Faith alone juſtifies. There is added, *And when he doth mention faith, as the condition, he alwayes implyeth obedience to Chriſt, therefore* [*believing*] *and* [*obeying the Goſpel*] *are put for the two ſummaries of the whole conditions:* But Faith as an inſtrument receiving Chriſt is the condition, when the Evangeliſt complains, that *He came to his own, and his own received him not*, Joh. 1.11. he points out their neglect of the condition required: They were his in Covenant, or elſe they had not been called his own; and in not receiving him they failed in the condition required of them; and in the words following the Evangeliſt ſpeaks of thoſe of his own in Covenant, that did make good the condition of it, and that is no otherwiſe then by believing; *But as many as received him, to them he gave power to be the Sons of God, even to them that believe on his Name.* And this faith implyes onely acceptation, though it be an act of the

ſoul that yeelds obedience. It is further ſaid, *Our full juſtification, and our everlaſting ſalvation have the ſame conditions on our part: But ſincere Obedience is without all doubt a condition of our ſalvation; Therefore alſo of our juſtification.* Here is either a manifeſt tautology, or an errour. For either full juſtification, and ſalvation are both one, and ſo here is a tautology; or elſe, if they differ, it is an errour. The ſame are not conditions of both ſtrictly taken, onely Faith gives title to Chriſt for Juſtification; Works qualifie as a condition in order to ſalvation. And whereas it is further ſaid, *It would be as derogatory to Chriſts righteouſneſſe if we be ſaved by works, as if we be juſtified by them.* Either of both is doubtleſſe derogatory to it, and therefore ſtill diſclaimed in Scriptures, and alwayes expreſly denyed, except in that one Text of *James*, Jam. 2. which ſpeakes to Juſtification, and muſt admit of another interpretation then our Authour would put upon it, otherwiſe he can neither be reconciled to himſelf, nor to the whole current of the Goſpel. Works may be *cauſa ſine quâ non* of ſalvation, or a qualification of thoſe that are ſaved, as, *Heb.* 5. 9. *He became the Authour of eternal ſalvation to all them that obey him.* But this is not to be ſaved by works, which the Apoſtle denyes, *Eph.* 2. 9. Not of works, leſt any man ſhould boaſt. And works of this efficiency, wrought through grace, will raiſe a man to boaſtings, as appears in the Phariſees [*God, I thank thee.*] But ſeeing there are ſeveral new queſtions ſtarted, *Whether Faith be an inſtrument in Juſtification? Whether works do not juſtifie? Whether the new Covenant have any condition? Whether Faith be not the alone condition? And how Repentance can be a condition of the Covenant, and not of Juſtification?* And Mr. *Ball* is almoſt on every hand appealed to, I ſuppoſe it will not be ungrateful to the Reader, if in this place I commend to him the words of that Reverend Authour, (though it be in a larger way, then quotations are ordinarily brought) in which we have not barely his authority, (which I do not offer to put in the balance with any) but the Points in queſtion with ſingular ſtrength, debated and ſpoken to; Treating of the Covenant of Grace, pag. 18. he ſaith, Repentance is called for in this Covenant, as it ſetteth forth the ſubject capable of ſalvation by faith, but is it ſelf onely an acknowledgment of ſin no healing of our wound, or cauſe of our acquittance. The feeling of pain and ſickneſſe, cauſeth a man to

Luke 13. 5.
Acts 11. 18.
2 Cor. 7. 10.
Ezek. 18. 27.

deſire

deſire and ſeek remedy, but it is no remedy it ſelf. Hunger and thirſt make a man deſire and ſeek for food, but a man is not fed by being hungry. By repentance we know our ſelves, we feel our ſickneſſe, we hunger and thirſt after grace, but the hand which we ſtretch forth to receive it, is faith alone, without which repentance is nothing but darkneſſe and deſpair. Repentance is the condition of faith, and the qualification of a perſon capable of ſalvation, on our part required. It is a penitent and petitioning Faith, whereby we receive the Promiſes of mercy, but we are not juſtified partly by prayer, partly by Repentance, and partly by Faith, but that faith which ſtirreth up godly ſorrow for ſin, and enforceth us to pray for pardon and ſalvation. Faith is a neceſſary and lively inſtrument of Juſtification, which is amongſt the number of true cauſes, not being a cauſe without which the thing is not done; but a cauſe whereby it is done. The cauſe without which a thing is not done, is onely preſent in the action, and doth nothing therein: but as the eye is an active inſtrument for ſeeing, and the eare for hearing; ſo is faith alſo for juſtifying. If it be demanded, whoſe inſtrument it is? It is the inſtrument of the ſoul, wrought therein by the Holy Ghoſt, and is the free gift of God. In the Covenant of works, works were required as the cauſe of life and happineſſe: but in the Covenant of grace, though repentance be neceſſary, and muſt accompany faith, yet not repentance but faith onely is the cauſe of life. The cauſe not efficient, as works ſhould have been, if man had ſtood in the former Covenant, but inſtrumentall onely: for it is impoſſible that Chriſt, the death and blood of Chriſt, and our faith, ſhould be together the efficient or procuring cauſes of Juſtification or ſalvation. When the Apoſtle writeth, that man is not juſtified by works, or through works, by the Law, or through the Law (oppoſing Faith and Works in the matter of Juſtification, but not in reſpect of their preſence; Faith, I ſay, and works, not faith and merits which could never be) without doubt he excludes the efficiency and force of the Law and works in juſtifying: But the particles [By] and [Of] do not in the ſame ſenſe, take Juſtification from the Law and Works, in which they give it to faith. For faith onely doth behold and receive the promiſes of life and mercy; but the Law, and Works, reſpect the Commandments, not the Promiſes of meer grace. When therefore Juſtification and life is ſaid to be

Rom. 3. 21, 22, 28, 30. Gal. 2. 16, 17. Rom. 4. 2, 3.

by Faith, it is manifestly signified, that faith receiving the promise, doth receive righteousnesse and life freely promised. Obedience to all Gods Commandments is covenanted, not as the cause of life, but as the qualification and effect of faith, and as the way to life. Faith that imbraceth life is obediential, and fruitful in all good works: but in one sort faith is the cause of obedience and good works, and in another of Justification and life eternal. These it seeketh in the promises of the Covenant: those it worketh and produceth, as the cause doth the effect. Faith was the efficient cause of that precious oblation in *Abel*, of reverence and preparing the Ark in *Noah*, of obedience in *Abraham*; but it was the instrument onely of their Justification. For it doth not justifie as it produceth good works, but as it receiveth Christ; though it cannot receive Christ, unlesse it bring forth good works. A disposition to good works is necessary to Justification, being the qualification of an active and lively faith. Good works of all sorts are necessary to our continuance in the state of Justification, and so to our final absolution, if God give opportunity: but they are not the cause of, but onely a precedent qualification or condition to final forgivenesse and eternal blisse. If then when we speak of the conditions of the Covenant of grace, by condition we understand whatsoever is required on our part, as precedent, concomitant, or subsequent to Justification, repentance, faith and obedience are all conditions: but if by condition we understand what is required on our part, as the cause of the good promised, though onely instrumental, faith or belief in the promises of free mercy is the onely condition. Faith and works are opposed in the matter of Justification and salvation in the Covenant; not that they cannot stand together in the same subject, for they be inseparably united, but because they cannot concur or meet together in one and the same Court to the Justification or absolution of man. For in the Court of Justice according to the first Covenant, either being just, he is acquitted; or unjust, he is condemned: But in the Court of mercy, if thou receive the promise of pardon, which is done by a lively faith, thou art acquitted and set free, and accepted as just and righteous: but if thou believe not, thou art sent over to the Court of Justice. Thus far Mr. *Ball*. In which words of his the blood of Christ, faith in his blood, repentance and works have all of them their due place assigned them. The blood of Christ

Deut. 7. 12. & 10. 12. Jer. 7. 23. Lev. 19. 17, 18. Luk. 10. 27. Mark 12. 30.

Heb. 11. 4, 7, &c.

Chriſt as the alone efficient procuring cauſe; Faith as the inſtrument giving intereſt, and making application: Repentance as a neceſſary qualification of the juſtified perſon in order to glory. In this (which is the good old Proteſtant doctrine) God loſeth nothing of his grace, but all is free in the work. Chriſt loſeth nothing of his merit, it ſtands alone as the procuring cauſe. Faith receives all from Chriſt, but takes nothing off from the free grace of God, or Chriſts merits. God loſeth nothing of his Soveraignty, and man is not at all diſpenſed with in his duty. God is advanced in his goodneſſe and Soveraignty: man is kept humble, thankful, and in ſubjection, no place being left for his pride, or gap open for licentiouſneſſe.

A Digreſſion concerning the Inſtrumentality of Faith in Juſtification.

HEre I cannot paſſe by that which Mr. *Baxter* hath animadverted on ſome paſſages of mine, in the Treatiſe of the Covenant, concerning the Inſtrumentality of Faith. After I had ſpoke to our Juſtification by Faith, in oppoſition to Juſtification by works, in ſeveral Propoſitions, (of which he is not pleaſed to take any notice) I infer, pag. 80. [Theſe things conſidered, I am truly ſorry, that Faith ſhould be denyed to have the office or place of an inſtrument, in our Juſtification: nay, ſcarce allowed to be called an inſtrument of our receiving Chriſt, that juſtifies us. Mr. *Baxter* not acquainting his Reader at all, with the premiſes, immediately falls upon this inference: making himſelf ſomewhat merry, with my profeſſing my ſelf to be truly ſorry for this thing; telling me *I was as ſorry, that men called, and ſo called, faith the inſtrument of juſtification, as you are that I deny it*, acquainting his Reader with his Reaſons, which he would have to be compared with mine, which he paſſes over in ſilence. 1. *No Scripture doth* (ſayes he) *either in the letter, or ſenſe, call faith an inſtrument of Juſtification.* This the Reader muſt take on his word, and it ſhould further be conſidered, whether he do not in the ſame page contradict himſelf, where he ſaith, *It is onely the unfitneſſe, or impropriety of the phraſe that he mentions, and not the ſenſe.* 2. Saith he, *I knew I had much Scripture, and reaſon*

reaſon againſt it; but I find no reaſon from him, but that which ſome know that I have urged *Terminis Terminantibus*, before his Aphoriſmes ever came to light; and had I not been able to have given my ſelf ſatisfaction, I had been in that opinion (if not before him, yet) before I had any light from him, to lead me to it. That horned Argument of his, that if faith juſtifie as inſtrument, it is either as an inſtrument in the hand of God, or in the hand of man, with his reaſons againſt both, I have made uſe of *argumentandi cauſâ*, before any work of his ſaw the light.

The inſtrumentality of faith makes not man the efficient cauſe of his own Juſtification.

3. *I thought it* (ſaith he) *of dangerous conſequence to ſay, that man is the efficient cauſe of juſtifying, and pardoning himſelf, and ſo doth forgive his own ſins.* And I think every honeſt man ſhould be of that mind, and I ſhall wait the time when proof ſhall be made, that Juſtification by faith, in oppoſition to works, makes man κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *The efficient*, and that Juſtification by works gives it to God onely. If this be once made good, I ſhall be more ſorry than ever for holding ſuch ſelf-exalting and man-advancing doctrine as Juſtification by faith, and that ever I oppoſed that ſelf-denying, man-depreſſing doctrine of Juſtification by works, and ſhall henceforth conclude, *Where is boaſting then? It is excluded: by what Law? of faith? Nay, but by the Law of works.* There is added, *Yet all this had never cauſed me to open my mouth againſt it, but for the next, viz. I found that many learned Divines did not onely aſſert this inſtrumentality, but laid ſo great a ſtreſſe upon it, as if the main difference betwixt us and the Papiſts lay here. For in the doctrine of Juſtification it is, ſay they, that they fundamentally erre, and we principally differ, and that in theſe four Points.*

Four great errours laid to the charge of Reformers.

1. *About the formal cauſe of our righteouſneſſe, which, ſay theſe Divines, is the formal righteouſneſſe of Jeſus Chriſt, as ſuffering and perfectly obeying for us; or, as others adde, in the habitual righteouſneſſe of his humane nature; and others, the natural righteouſneſſe of the Divine nature.* 2. *About the way and manner of our participation therein, which as to Gods act, they ſay is imputation, (which is true) and that in this ſenſe that* legaliter *we are eſteemed to have fulfilled the Law in Chriſt.* 3. *About the nature of that faith which juſtifies; which, moſt of our forreign Reformers ſay, is an aſſurance, or full perſwaſion of the pardon of my ſin by Chriſts blood.* 4. *About the formal reaſon of faiths intereſt in Juſtification, which, ſay they, is as the inſtrument thereof.* Adding his own cenſure, *I doubt not but all theſe four are great errours.*

rours. Of how dangerous conſequence ſoever it is, that man ſhould be made the efficient of juſtifying, and pardoning himſelf, yet it had paſs'd without controll, if worſe than this had not been vented, by the learned of the reformed Religion; It is yet well, that when the ignorance of all his profeſſed Antagoniſts is of that eminence, that yet ſo many learned are on their party. Thoſe learned errours ſhould be taken into further conſideration, and ſome that are learned, have entred the liſts with Mr. *Baxter* in them. The ſecond of theſe great errours he tells us is true, and how a great errour can be true, I cannot tell, unleſſe his meaning be, that it is truly an errour, which is as high an equivocal ſpeech as any that is faſtened upon the Scriptures. And when this ſecond is true, I cannot ſee, (and I think few of his Readers will ſee) how the firſt to which it relates can be falſe. If it be true, that by Gods imputation of this righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, we are *legaliter* eſteemed to have fulfilled the Law in Chriſt, then that is true alſo, that they ſay, that Chriſt is our righteouſneſſe, or that the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt of meer grace is made ours. And how much good will is here ſhewen to the *reforming* part is too manifeſt, in making one Party amongſt them to hold, *that the natural righteouſneſſe of the Divine nature is our Juſtification*, as *Bellarmine* did before him, and is anſwered by *Davenant*, de juſt. habit. p. 313. *That in this all the Churches of the Proteſtants have exploded Hoſiander*; It being his ſingular opinion; and another ſayes, *This opinion was almoſt like Jonas his gourd that did preſently wither.* As for the third, the charge is upon our forreign *Reformers* onely; and not upon all that have idly buſied their learned heads in this bad cauſe; They onely ſay, that faith is a full perſwaſion of the pardon of my ſins by Chriſts blood. I ſhall requeſt from him therefore a Latine Treatiſe; for their better information in this thing, and not to trouble Controverſies in Engliſh, with that, in which his Engliſh Antagoniſts ſtand right, himſelf being witneſſe. Neither is it all forreign Divines that go that way; *Gomarus* putting it to the queſtion ſaith, That there be ſome of thoſe that have oppoſed Papiſts on either part, and himſelf determines with them that ſide in this with our Engliſh Reformers, Tom. 2. pag. 371. So that in theſe three our Engliſh Reformers at leaſt ſtand fully acquitted. That which followes, I doubt not will be the trouble of many of his Readers. *That which troubled me* (ſaith he) *was this,*

The natural righteouſneſſe of Chriſts Divine nature is not our Juſtification.

All forreign Reformers make no faith a full perſwaſion.

this, to think how many thouſand might be confirmed in Popery by this courſe, and what a blow it gave to the reformed Religion. For who can imagine but that young Popiſh ſtudents will be confirmed in the reſt of their religion, when they find that we erre in theſe, and will judge by theſe of the reſt of our doctrine; eſpecially when they find us making this the main part of the Proteſtant cauſe, what wonder if they judg our cauſe naught? It is a greater wonder, that old Popiſh ſtudents have not diſcovered this to their novices, but have left this work to Mr. *Baxter*, to give them light in this in which *Reformers* ſo erre, and unreformed Papiſts ſtand right, ſo that it muſt be his work, not *Bellarmines*, *Stapletons*, *Suarez* or any others to unreform.

But leſt this ſhould be a ſtumbling block to offence, that ſo eminent a man (that is like, if himſelf may be heard, to draw away ſo many) ſpeaks out ſuch Language; let us oppoſe againſt him on the other hand, *Albertus Pighius*, whom *thoſe of his party* (as *Peter Martyr* ſaies, loc. com. pag. 541. *made their Achilles, and thought, that he alone by his ſubtile wit, had pierced into the inward Myſteries of truth.* So that I hope I am not too low in my compariſon. This great wit of the Popiſh party reading Mr. *Calvin*, to confute him in the point of juſtification, was confuted by him, and wrote with us againſt his own party, as is not onely affirmed by men of our party, (as *Davenant* de juſt. habit. cap. 29. pag. 382. *Albertus Pighius*, (ſaith he) *in his controverſies largely explains and confirms our opinion.* 1. *He excludes inherent righteouſneſſe from any efficacy in juſtification.* 2. *He manifeſtly approves the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſſe.* *Laſtly, He gives his reaſon, why the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt is imputed to us for juſtification.* And then addes, *Many more things are found in the ſame author, who, though in other controverſies, he maintains a fierce warre with Proteſtants, yet being overcome with the clear light of truth in this of Juſtification, he fell off from the Papiſts and came over to our party.* And *Capel* in his preface to Mr. *Pembles* tract of juſtification, *Pighius* (ſaith he) *though of a peeviſh ſpirit enough, yet reading* Calvin, *to confute Calvin, in the very doctrine of juſtification, was confuted himſelf, and wrote with us*) but alſo acknowledged by our adverſaries. *Albertus Pighius is checkt by Bellarmine* (ſaith Dr. *Prideaux* lect. 5. Pag. 165.) *for that in reading our authors, himſelf at laſt became a Lutheran, in this article.* And that *Pighius* may not ſtand alone on our parts among Romaniſts

Pighius a learned Papiſt joynes with Proteſtants in the doctrine of Juſtification, and many others.

Romaniſts; *Davenant* in the place quoted produces many others. 1. *The whole covent of Canons at Cullen* in their book which they entituled *Antididagma*, Who acknowledge the imputed righteouſneſſe of Chriſt to be the chief cauſe of our juſtification, Titu. de juſtific. 2. *The Romiſh party in the Conference of Ratisbone*, Who (ſaith he) gave their vote the ſame way, pag. 47. 3. *Iſidore Clacius*, orat. 40. in Luc. 4. *Naclantus Epiſcopus Clodienſis*, cap. 1. ad Epheſ. pag. 59, 72. The two firſt of theſe authorities are quoted by Dr. *Prideaux* likewiſe, Adding, that *Caſſander, Stapulenſis, Peraldus, Ferus, Arius Montanus*, did tread in the ſame path: and therefore, miſerably ſuffer by the *Index Expurgatorius*, *Cardinal Contarenus* is likewiſe frequently quoted by *Ameſius* as on our party. And Dr. *Prideaux*, ſaith, that *almoſt four yeares before the Councel of Trent he had ſo aſſerted the orthodox doctrine of Juſtification, that (being, as is thought, taken away by poyſon) he did not long ſurvive.* And for the whole ſpace between *Gregory* and the reformation, our author pronounces it, that authors generally for the moſt part were more ſound in their commentaries, then in their diſputations, and in their meditations, ſoliloquies, and conflict of temptations; then in their polemicks. Bringing in *Chemnitius* inſtancing in *Bonaventure* and others. So that in caſe they have one of eminence amongſt us, we hāve one of theirs as eminent: and in caſe he ſhould prove too light, we have many more into the bargain to make up weight.

There followes, *Now to the thing it ſelf: Your Arguments for faiths inſtrumentality to Juſtification I will conſider, when I can find them.* And his Reader will conſider no more of his jeeres, when he can look into his books, and his eyes miſſe of them. Some of thoſe of whom he hath made boaſt, as his converts in this controverſy, have profeſſed themſelves ſatisfied with that which I have written, though Mr. *Baxter* cannot find it. I am told that *I begin and ſay more for faiths Inſtrumentality in receiving Chriſt, than for the inſtrumentality of it in Juſtification.* And the truth is, I know not how to diſtinguiſh them. If it be an inſtrument to receive Chriſt, that doth juſtifie; it is with me an inſtrument in Juſtification. If mine eye be an inſtrument by which I receive in light, for ſight; then mine eye is the organ, or inſtrument of ſight. If I prove the one, I think I cannot be denyed the other. The Inſtrumentality of faith for receiving Chriſt, is thus reaſoned

against. *If Faith be the instrument of receiving Christ then it is either the act, or the habit of Faith, that is the Instrument.* I am well aware that if I shall affirm either of these, that then either some text of Scripture will be called for specifying such habit or act of faith in justification, or a needlesse stirre will be made about these Logical notions. The safest way then is to say with Scripture, that faith is the grace that receives Christ, and that interests us in propitiation in his blood, and the grace by which upon that account we are justified, without limitation of it to either the act or habit. Neither can any answer, (as I suppose) be thus given, but such as will *coincidere*; If I say the habit justifies, it is as it puts forth it self into act; If I say the act justifies, it must be as it comes from the habit, and so both habit and act justifie. Neither doth a mans justification cease when the habit of Faith in sleep ceaseth acting, seeing justification denotes a state which is remaining, and abiding. It is further said, *Receiving strictly taken is ever passive.* A reason then may be seen, why Divines have called faith a passive instrument in justification; and Mr. *Baxter* may see a fair answer to the high, and indeed scornful censure, that he gives to the most learned, (as himself stiles them) in his preface to this apology. *The most learned* (saith he) *in the upshot flie to this that* credere, *is not* agere, *but* pati, *and is but* Actio Grammatica, *or the name of action, but Physically or Hyperphysically a suffering; Is not here a curious doctrine of faith, and justification? If Aristotle had been a Christian, he could not have comprehended it.* But I confesse I see no reason to make receiving, and consequently believing, to be at least meerly passive. There is alwaies an act of the will, in rational agents in receiving, properly so called, and often of the hand. The receivers of custome are agents for the States, and in their receipt are active. *Receiving in a civil, ethical, lesse proper sense* (as is further said) *is but the act of accepting what is offered.* But is not this accepting properly receiving? or is not receiving properly so called, at least necessarily joyned with it, in such civil ethical reception? When I give a beggar an almes, does not he in as strict a sense receive it, as I do give it? and this is either his act of acceptance, or that which accompanies it. If I put water into a vessel, the vessel rather contains it, then receives it. If I give a child a lash, he rather suffers then receives it. So that receiving strictly taken, is as well active as passive, and rather active then passive. There is added, *When it is one-*

Whether the act of faith, or the habit doth justifie?

Neither receiving nor believing are in the Authors thoughts meerly passive.

ly

ly a relation, or a jus ad rem *that is offered, conſent or acceptance, as an act ſo neceſſary ordinarily to the poſſeſſion, or proper paſſive reception, that it is therefore called receiving it ſelf*; and it is therefore (as I think) called ſo, becauſe it is ſo, and that it hath its concurrence, and way of efficacy for poſſeſſion, I think few except Mr. *Baxter* will deny. It followes, *Yet ſtill I ſay, if any will pleaſe to call it an inſtrument, in this ſenſe, I will not quarrel with him for the impropriety of a phraſe, eſpecially if ſome men had the ſame ingenuity that others have, that ſay it is but Inſtrumentum Metaphoricum.* There is not I hope ſo much ingenuity deſired, as to ſmother or blind their reaſon. If it be a metaphorical inſtrument, there muſt be ſome real analogy between it and an inſtrument properly ſo called, in doing that which is done by an inſtrument, and when an inſtrument is (as is affirmed) an efficient; An inſtrument without any efficiency at all, is a ſtrange kind of Metaphor; It had been better to have held to the old dialect of *Equivocal*. There followes. *But to ſay* (ſaith he) *that the act of Faith is the inſtrument of Ethical, active reception, (which is that which I argued againſt) is to ſay receiving Chriſt is the inſtrument of it ſelf.* It will ſure rather follow that Faith is the inſtrument of the ſoul in receiving Chriſt.

We ſay faith receives, as we ſay the hand takes, or the ſword kills; but we mean the man receives by the hand, and the hand kills by the ſword, and ſo we mean the ſoul receives Chriſt by faith. I explained my ſelf in giving inſtance in mens uſual language concerning faith, which is rejected with no little diſdain, affirming that theſe ſpeeches, *Faith is the eye of the ſoul, the hand of the ſoul, are Metaphors of meere humane uſe*; forgetting (it ſeems) that ever the Scripture ſaid, that *Moſes by faith endured, as ſeeing him that is inviſible*; or that *the promiſe of the Spirit is received by faith.* If I had added that faith is the foot of the ſoul, they had all been Metaphors of Divine uſe: I urge Scripture texts. *We receive remiſſion of ſins by faith, and an inheritance amongſt them that are ſanctified*, is received by faith, *Act.* 26.18. To which is replyed. *If* [*by*] *ſignifie an inſtrumental cauſe, it is either alwayes, or ſometimes. You would not ſure have your Reader believe that it is alwayes: if but ſometimes, why do you take it for granted that ſo it ſignifies here?* This I might well retort, If it ſignifie and an inſtumental cauſe ſometimes, why is it not made appear, that it does not ſo ſignifie here? But I confeſſe

Faith is the inſtrument of the ſoul; and not of it ſelf in receiving Chriſt. That faith is the eye and hand of the ſoul, are Scripture Metaphors.

feſſe that [*by*] hath not alwayes ſuch ſignification. *Bartimeus* ſate *by* the high-way-ſide begging, in which place [*by*] is no inſtrument, but when the particle [*by*] hath reference to that which hath immediate reference to a principal cauſe; and ſometimes is put to the principal cauſe it ſelf: I ſuppoſe nothing elſe but an inſtrument can be intended: when Chriſt is ſaid to be ſet forth a propitiation through faith in his blood, *Rom.*3. 25. and that we are juſtified by his blood, *Rom.*5.9. I know not how the blood of Chriſt can be a principal cauſe and faith not denote an inſtrument. I ſaid, why elſe is this righteouſneſſe ſometimes called the *righteouſneſſe of faith*, ſometimes the *righteouſneſſe of God by faith*, but that it is a righteouſneſſe which faith receives? To this is replyed, *It is properer to ſay* Credens recipit credendo, *the believer by believing receives it, then to ſay, faith, eſpecially the act, receives it.* Here is an egregious ſubtilety; It is more proper to ſay, I receieve a gift by my hand, then to ſay, my hand receives it, of the ſame ſtamp with another; where it is ſaid that Scripture ſayes, That we are *juſtified by faith*, yet denyed, that Scripture ſayes, that *faith juſtifies.* But be it ſo, that is properer; does not Scripture ſpeak as improperly? *Eye hath not ſeen, Eare hath not heard.* It had been as much properer to have ſaid, No man hath ſeen with his eye, or heard with his ear. I quote *Epheſ.*3. 17. *Chriſt dwells in us by faith*; and, Gal.3.14. *We receive the promiſe of the Spirit through faith.* There I ſay [Scripture ſpeaks of faith as the ſouls inſtrument, to receive Chriſt Jeſus, and to receive the Spirit from Chriſt Jeſus:] and I am anſwered. *You odly change the queſtion: we are ſpeaking of faiths inſtrumentality in receiving a right to Chriſt, or Chriſt in relation, and you go about to prove the reception of his Spirit, or graces really, or himſelf objectively*, and ſo we have a large diſcourſe of Chriſts dwelling in us. But is it not to the purpoſe, to ſhew that the phraſe [by faith] notes inſtrumentality which theſe texts make good; and does not Chriſt dwell in us to more purpoſes then one? Is it not to all purpoſes, that by faith we receive him? And then our receiving right to him is not here excluded. I ſaid [the inſtrumentality of it in the work of juſtification is denyed, becauſe the nature of an inſtrument as conſidered in Phyſical operations, doth not exactly belong to it; which if it muſt be alwayes rigidly followed, will often put us to a ſtand in the aſſignation of cauſes of any kind in moral actions.] To this is replyed, *I ſaid*

1. *The*

1. *The action of the principal cause, and of the instrument is but one action, is not this true of moral operation as well as Physical?* To this I answer, I think here some demurre might be put, and scarce believe that it will be fully made good; that the action of the principal agent, and the instruments which are ὄργανα λόγικα are alwayes exactly one, though the act of the instrument may be in such cases Interpretative ly called the act of the principal agent; as *David* is said to have slain *Uriah* with the sword of the *Ammonites*. *Saul* I am sure was of an other mind, when intending the death of *David*, he said, Let not my hand be upon him, but the hand of the *Philistines*, 1 Sam. 18. 17. But in case it be granted, what hath he gained? He adds, 2. *I say, the instrument must have influx to the producing of the effect of the principal cause by a proper causality, that is in suo genere.* Demanding, *Is not this true of moral operations as well as Physical?* Then yeelding that it is true, *Moral causes may be said to have a lesse proper causation then Physical, &c.* And this lesse proper causation; I doubt not, but may be found in faith, and as proper a causation as an instrument of this nature will bear. I say, [The material and formal causes in justification are scarce agreed upon, and no marvel then, in case men mind to contend about it, that some question is raised about the instrument,] &c. To this there is much spoke; telling me what he would have me to have concluded, comparing me to plunderers in time of fight; which would but weary the Reader to see repeated: whereas after other words I add, [I do not doubt but it will easily appear, that those Divines that with a concurrent judgement, (without almost a dissenting voyce, have made faith an instrument in this work) speaking most aptly, and most agreeably to the nature of an instrument] He is pleased to reply, *But, Sir, what's the cause of this sudden change? Through their great condescension, I have received animadversions from many of the most learned judicious Divines that I know in* England. *And of all these there is but one man that doth own the doctrine of faiths instrumentality; but they disclaime it all, some with distaste, others with a modest excuse of them that use it, and the gentle Interpretation of a metaphorical instrument, and that remote; for so they would have me Interpret our Divines. I told you this when I saw you, and you asked me whether Mr. C. were against it? To which I answer, not so much as diverse others, that write to me, but judge you by his own words,*

which

which are these, [*Object. But though faith be not the instrument of our justification, may it not be called the instrument of receiving Christ? Answ. I think they mean so and no more who call faith the instrument of our justification, &c. I shall not be unwilling to yeeld to you, that to speak exactly, faith may better be called a condition of our justification*] *so farre* Mr. C. To this I answer, 1. Why have we not the authority of Divines that are open to all mens eyes, rather then of those that lye dormant in his hands? and there are sure more in the presse, then in his private study in Manuscripts. No one is produced, and I scarce think can be produced. 2. I would he would publish to the world the labours of these eminently learned persons; that we, as well as he, might see their weak opposition of plain Scripture, which somewhere is his free censure. 3. There are those (if intelligence do not deceive me) that he hath said, he hath brought to his judgement in this thing, that yet have professed themselves satisfied with that which I have said, and are they of both our minds? 4. For Mr. *C.* upon the coming forth of this *Apology* he wrote to me, among other things in these words: *Mr.* Baxter, pag. 19. *citeth some words of mine about faiths instrumentality, but it had been fair to have signified what I say further about it, especially in my second writing, when I perceived what advantage he did take of that which I had said before; onely to avoid contending about words, which I do not like*: so far Mr. *C.* I said in my Treatise, [the work about which faith is imployed, is not an absolute, but a relative work; a work of God towards man, not without the actuall concurrence of man: such in which neither God, nor man are sole efficients; nor any act of God, or man, can be sole instruments, but there must be a mutual concurrence of both.] To this is replyed, *A dangerous doctrine in my judgement, to be so nakedly affirmed; no doubt but justification is a relative change, and it is past controversie, that it is not without the actual concurrence of man, for he must perform the condition on which God will justifie him: But that God is not the sole efficient, nor any act of God the sole instrument, I durst not have affirmed without proof;* Neither durst I have charged any mans speech with danger of that nature without disproof, unlesse I should think it enough to make it so, because in my judgement it appears so; and that which is here granted as without controversie, is with me a proof sufficient. If it be not done without the actual concurrence of man, and

Mr. C. vindicated.

and is done by such concurrence of which we have as many proofs, as there is mention of justification by faith, there must be some kind of efficiency in this concurrence; that man should be justified by faith, and faith have no hand at all in it, I cannot reach. I bring for proof the absurdity that will follow upon denyal in these words; [This must needs be granted, unlesse we will bring in Dr. *Crispes* passive recipiency of Christ; Christs abode in man, without man, in spight of man, and suppose him to be justified in unbelief.] To this is replyed. *This is very naked asserting; why did you not shew some reason of this ill consequence?] It's past any reach to see the least.* If I were too short, it is now done to my hands, where a mutual concurrence of God and man in the work is confest; tell me how it can be denyed, unlesse Christ come into man without man, and in spite of him; for if man act in it, he must needs be an agent. It followes, *Why do you still confound Christs real abode in us by his Spirit with the relation we have upon justification? when even now you affirmed it was a relative work (as you call it) I pray by the next shew us more clearly, how these absurdities follow that doctrine.* And doth not a relative work of this nature necessarily presuppose this abode by the Spirit? and is not a relative change a necessary consequent of it? If strangers to Christ be justified by Christ, I am to learn in the doctrine of justification, that desire of his I think is already satisfied. I further say, faith is disabled from this office in justification, by this argument: If faith be an instrument [It is the instrument of God or man, &c. to which in my Treatise I answered, it is the instrument of man; though man do not justifie himself, yet he concurres as a ready willing agent with God in it.] To which is replyed, *If this be not a palpable contradiction, saying, and unsaying, my Logick is lesse then I thought it had been. If it be [mans instrument] of justification, and yet [man do not justifie himself] then either man is not man, or an instrument is not an instrument, or justifying is not justifying.* It seems he would have us by the way know that his thoughts of his own Logick are not low; but if other mens Logick cannot solve this contradiction; yet me thinks his might, who sayes receiving strictly taken is ever passive, and a man may be passive in justification, and not justifie himself. But perhaps with me it is of more difficulty that have affirmed, That reception hath still somewhat at least of action in it; but this reception here in question, hath no more

There is somewhat of efficiency in mans concurrence by faith in Justification.

The relative change in Justificarion necessarily presupposes a reall.

The Author acquit from the charge of a palpable contradiction.

Instruments of meer reception and further operation distinguished.

more of action then serves to possesse it self of a free gift; which ever adds honour to the giver, not to the receiver: I distinguish therefore of instruments *of meer reception*, and instruments *of further operation*; that which is objected holds of instruments wholly operative, not of those that are meerly receptive. A man receives a gift with his hand, as the lame man was ready to do, when he expected something from *Peter* and *John*, *Act.* 3.5. and he earnes his living with his hand, as *Paul* did, when in some exigents his hands ministred to his necessities, *Act.* 20.34. In the former mans hand concurres to his enriching, but he enriches not himself, as in the later. The denomination is from the fountaine, whence all flowes, not from the hand that accepts, or the cistern that doth receive. There is added. *In my judgement this doctrine should not be made part of our Religion, nor much stresse laid on it, if it were true, because it is so obscure.* It seems then that not I, but our *Religion*, is the author of this so high a contradiction; so that I cannot defend Religion, but I am put upon it to assert such contradictions; and who layes greatest stresse upon that which is not obscure and dark, I leave to the Reader of Mr. *Baxters Aphorismes* and *Apology* to determine. It followes, *That man concurres as a ready agent, who doubts? but doth that prove him, or his faith the efficient cause of his own pardon and justification?* Do I, or doth our *Religion* make man or faith the efficient cause of his own pardon, and justification? Quote some words of mine or some Article of faith in any of the Protestant Confessions that affirmes it; were some others in my stead they would highly rhetoricate, and tell the world what would be said when they are dead. But this is my comfort, when I am dead, *Religion* will stand up for its own defence: that the concurrence of a ready agent hath somewhat of efficiency in it, I think none can deny; and that such concurrence that I have mentioned can rise to be the efficient I think, very few will affirm. And to bring my self into that which he before hand charges to be so absurd, I said, [And because it is the instrument of man in a work of this nature, it is also the instrument of God. As some have observed a communication of titles between Christ and his Church (the Church being called by his name): so there is a communication of actions in these relative works. *Christ dwells in our hearts by faith*, Ephes. 3.17. We believe, and not Christ: and yet [faith] there is Christs instrument, whereby he takes up his abode

Faith is the instrument both of God and man in the work of justification.

abode. *God purifies the hearts of the Gentiles by faith*, Act. 15. 17. They believed and not God: yet faith is Gods instrument in the work of their purification. So on the other side the Spirit is Gods work: yet we by the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the flesh, *Rom.* 8. 13.] Here Mr. *Baxter* first takes in hand the thing that I assert, and when he hath done falls upon the proof which is first to quarrel with the conclusion, and then to take the premises into consideration, 1. It is said, *If this be indeed true, that it is mans instrument of justification, and Gods both, then both God and man are causæ principales partiales by coordination, making up one principall cause*; This he thinks I will not affirm, and this indeed I do deny upon the reasons afore laid down, it is mans instrument for concurrence in it, but not of principall efficiency to produce it: In case I had affirmed, he gives in his reason of denyal of it in a Similitude of an absolute donor, in which I grant the conclusion, and therefore shall not trouble the Reader with it. As to the proof that I bring, he first excepts against that which I say, others have observed, and say: *This communication of titles*, 1. *is very rare.* 2. *uncertain whether ever*, and goeth about to take off that text, 1. *Cor.* 12. 12. But this being Heterogeneous to the work in hand, I shall let his exceptions alone, only pointing him out one another text; with which if he please, he may take like pains, *Jer.* 23. 6. *Jer.* 33. 16. Compared. After much ado to find out my meaning he resolves: *But it is like you intended to have said, that there is a common or mutuall attribution of each others actions, or one is intitled to the actions of the other: and so mean only a communication of the name quoad modum producendi, and not of the actions themselves.* And who but he, that would seek a knot in a Bul-rush could have thought of any other? but as the titles of one, are observed by some to be attribnted to another; so the actions proper to one, are attributed to the other? Then a Dilemma is brought against me, *either this is in an improper figurative way of speech, or it is proper and grounded in the nature of the thing*, and either of both is excepted against; I say the action of one is said *interpretative* to be the action of the other, because he makes use of it to do his own work, or bring about his own purpose. To the instance that I gave, [that Christ dwells in our hearts by faith] he saies there *is not a word to prove that there is a relative indwelling.* But Mr. *Br.* very well knowes that I did not oppose relative in this place

God and man are not coordinate causes in Justification.

to reall, as intending to hold forth any effect wrought by Christs indwelling: but the opposition is so absolute, as I expresst my self. I do not say that justification is directly spoke to in that place, yet there is a proof I think sufficient that Christ makes use of our act to effect his own work, which is as much as I intended elsewhere. Mr. *Br.* is so free as to yield that faith is an instrument to receive Christ, but here he stickles hard to deny it, but let us take notice of his concessions: *Christ* (saith he) *is said to dwell in us by faith.* 1. *Formaliter, Faith being the principal part of that grace which dwelleth in us.* And so we might say he dwells by Love, Hope, Meeknesse, Patience, which I think no Scripture or Orthodox Writer sayes. 2. *Conditionaliter; Faith being a condition of our right to the Spirits abode.* But it is so a condition as it is withall an instrumentall condition. It is not barely said, if you believe, I will give you my Spirit; which might imply barely a condition, as it is said, turn at my reproof, and I will pour out my Spirit upon you: but it is said, we receive the promise of the Spirit by faith. 3. *Efficienter. As the act of faith doth directly cause the encrease, and so the abode of the habit.* And is it may we think a principal, or is it an instrumental efficient? If an instrumental, I have what I desire, and I am sure he will not say it is a principal efficient. Mr. *Baxter* is, I am sure, as zealous as I can be to assert a conditionate Covenant: and if an adversary be as streight-laced to him, and me, in that, as he is to me in this; he will hardly prove a condition, either in the Covenant of works or grace. I will as soon find the word *instrument* in Scripture applyed to justification, as he shall find the word *condition* applyed to either Covenant. And he can name I think no word implying a condition that is alwayes put for a condition: and the context whersoever we are said to be justified *by faith*, or that Christ is a propitiation *through faith*, is in all indifferent Readers eyes as clear for an instrument in justification: as those which he, and I, can bring (which yet are clear enough) for a conditionate Covenant. And that doctrine hath farre more adversaries then this, though there is little cause that any man should be an adversary in either.

How Christ is said to dwell in us by faith.

He sayes, *the same answer serves to* Act. 15.9 and then the same reply may serve. There followes, *To what you say from* Rom. 8.13. *I reply,*

1. *An adjutor, or concause is ill called an instrument, must the*

Spirit

Spirit needs be our instrument, because it is by the Spirit? as if *by, signified onely an instrument.* Mr. *Baxters* head was doubtlesse on somewhat else, either when he read these passages of mine, or when he framed his answer. I never had it in my thoughts that justification is expressely spoken to in any of these texts, nor was it my businesse to find out any instrument in them, though I doubt not but that faith is spoken to as an instrument in two of them, and as a condition, non-instrumental in none of them; neither did I dream of making the Spirit an instrument. All that I intended was to prove, that the acts of man were intitled to God, and so the acts of God to man, not considering (as the businesse in hand led not to it) about what these acts are exercised: if they prove that, It is to me sufficient, whether it be in Justification, Sanctification, Mortification, or any other work. There is added. 2. *All this is nothing to the businesse of justification*; nothing directly, immediately, but much by way of Analogy. It is enough to prove, That, to be the instrument of man, and the instrument of God are not ἀσύστατα. And if he desire a proof more punctually applyed to justification, let him consult, *Rom* 3.30. *It is one God that shall justifie the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith*; and, Gal. 3.8. *The Scripture foreseeing that God would justifie the Heathen through faith.* Faith for justification is usually ascribed to man, being properly his act, and therefore that text of the Prophet, *Hab.* 2.4. *The just shall live by his faith*, is by the Apostle more then once applyed to justification: And in the text now quoted, this act of faith is ascribed to God, for that work. I explained my self [man neither justifies, nor sanctifies himself, yet by faith he is raised to close with God in both], &c. To this is answered, *If man justifie not himself, and yet faith be his instrument of justifying, then farewell old Logick.* Mr. *Baxter* is the first great Logitian, that I ever heard talk so much of his Logick in the last Section but one we had it, and now we have it in the same thing again; there I shewed that old Logick may stand, and yet his consequence not yeelded. 2. It is said, *If man sanctifie not himself under God, as to the progresse, and acts of sanctification, then farewell old Theology.* And if man may be said to sanctifie himself further then hath been said, or so as to be a principal efficient (which will follow from Mr. *Baxters* reasonings) then welcome the newest Divinity. It will not be denyed, that a sanctified

The acts of God are entitled to man, and the acts of man to God in Scripture.

man differs from one that is unsanctified, and then in ease it may be allowed to say, I sanctifie my self: he may say; I make my self to differ: which I never heard that any in direct termes would say against the Apostle, but *Grevenchovius*, as I find him cited by Dr. *Featly*, and yet it seems it is my great error, that I will not say so, I lift man up in that height in justification, as to pardon his own sin, in holding that it is *of faith*, that it may be *of grace*, not *of works lest any should boast*; And I raise him not high enough in sanctification, if I say no more then that by faith he receives power from God by the Spirit for it: that text, 1 *Pet.* 1.22. would farre better have served my purpose, if I had first hit upon it; *Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit*. They that have done any thing in purifying their hearts through the Spirit, will rather entitle the Spirit of God, then themselves to it, and will judge that he, rather then they should be denominated a *sanctifier*. And for other texts that are hinted, and one mentioned, 2 *Cor.* 7.1. To argue from the Command to the power, is that old Theologie, that I am ready to bid farewell to. As God requires it, so he doth often undertake it, and declares that it is his work to do it, *Ezek.* 36. 25,26. *Deut.* 30.6. I think few will say, that they make their own hearts new. There is added. 3. *To close with God in pardoning me, signifieth not, that I pardon my self, or that I or any act of mine is an efficient cause of pardon.* This is for me, therefore I am contented it should be said over again, and my faith is the instrument wherewith I close with God; In case it be the instrument wherewith I receive Christ, (as Mr. *Baxter* hath sometimes yeelded.) There followes. 4. *When you say that* [*faith as an instrument receiveth righteousnesse to justification*] *you speak exactly the conceptions of most Divines that I have met with, or read that go your way, and therefore these words deserve a little further consideration, and after some enquiry into their meaning.* There is added, *but these things must be more accurately considered I think.* Here it is confessed, that I tread in the beaten road, and that I do appear in the common cause, and comparing what is here said with that which in his conclusion he delivers: It appears that the Divines of this corner of the world for 1300. years past have all taken this way, which is all that go under the name Protestant, whether *Calvinist*, or *Lutheran*, as they are wont to be distinguished: I shall therefore expect, that some of those that

The Spirit of God and not man, is to have the denomination in sanctification.

The Author is confest to appear in the common cause in behalf of Protestants.

that by grace have obtained to be, as of the firſt three among *Davids* worthies, will ſtep in with their Auxiliary helps, in caſe the cauſe be prejudiced by my weakneſſe: He aſſigns me to the party of thoſe that he calls *Reformers*, pag. 16. on what party himſelf ſtands, it is eaſie then to determine. Having ſaid that theſe things are to be more accurately conſidered, he expreſſes himſelf without any one tittle of Scripture in eight particulars, I ſhall as briefly as I can take notice of the ſum of them.

Mr *Baxters* eight heads taken into conſideration.

1. *It muſt be known, that the righteouſneſſe given to us, is not the righteouſneſſe whereby Chriſts perſon was righteous, (for accidents periſh being removed from the ſubject) but it is a righteouſneſs merited by Chriſts ſatisfaction, and obedience for us.* Here we have a negation with its reaſons, and an oppoſite affirmation, without any reaſon at all. The negation is, That the righteouſneſſe given us is not the righteouſneſſe whereby Chriſts perſon was righteous. The reaſon is, *Accidents periſh being removed from the ſubject*, and therefore the righteouſneſſe given us is not the righteouſneſſe whereby Chriſts perſon was righteous; impliying that the *reformed* party take righteouſneſſe for juſtification out of Chriſt (and leave him belike without any righteouſneſſe) and put it into themſelves; and ſo as Chriſt was before, ſo now they are inherently righteous. He well knowes that they hold, that it is ſtill in Chriſt, and of grace reekoned to be ours; and therefore that of accidents periſhing needed not an opinion which he vehemently oppoſeth in his Preface to his Confeſſion. *If Chriſt onely* (ſaith he) *were righteous, Chriſt onely would be reputed, and judged righteous, and Chriſt onely would be happy. The Judge of the world will not juſtifie the unrighteous, meerly becauſe another is righteous; nor can the holy Ghoſt take complacency in an unholy ſinner, becauſe another is holy.* And yet himſelf holds, That the Judge of the world, will not onely take an infant born under the defilement of ſin into Covenant as holy; but alſo juſtifie him (though in his opinion uncapable of any real change by the Spirit) barely upon the account of the parents ſtate in grace through regeneration. We cannot be righteous through Chriſts righteouſneſſe; notwithſtanding we know, that in the Goſpel of grace, it is reckoned ours, and by faith have our intereſt. Yet an infant is righteous by the parents righteouſneſſe: Notwithſtanding we read not of any ſuch imputation, or any ſuch way of intereſt by faith or otherwiſe. I muſt crave leave to

hold

hold to the former which he leaves, though not with his, but Scripture comment upon it. God does not justifie us, meerly becauſe another is righteous; but becauſe Chriſt *is made of God to us righteouſneſſe*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. and is *Jehovah our righteouſneſſe* Jer. 23. 6. And to leave the latter which he holds: I believe neither regeneration nor juſtification to be from Parent to child *ex Traduce*. In which ſenſe that holds, *Nemo naſcitur, ſed fit Chriſtianus*. I chooſe rather with *Walæus* to ſubſcribe to the opinion of *Calvin*, lib. 4. inſtit. cap. 16. Sect. 20. That Infants are baptized into future Repentance and faith: which he ſaies is the opinion of moſt other Authors. I believe Mr. *Baxter* chiefly took up this opinion of juſtification of infants, *tanquam Apendices parentum*, for *Amiraldus* his ſake, who had it from *Camero*, and was his follower (as aged and reverend *Molinæus* ſaith) in nothing but his blemiſhes. And I would not have ſo good a friend and eminent ornament to the Church to make either of them, in theſe his precedents.

Amiraldus qui nihil Camero-nis imitatur preter nævos idem dicit.

The affirmation is, that *it is a righteouſneſſe merited by Chriſts ſatisfaction and obedience*. Here is a Propoſition delivered with very little accurateneſſe:

1. The righteouſneſſe given is here diſtinguiſhed from his obedience; when certainly this obedience is that which is given to us. *By the obedience of one many ſhall be made righteous*, Rom. 5. 29.

2. Chriſts ſatisfaction and obedience are here diſtinguiſhed; when his ſatisfaction was his obedience, *Joh.* 10. 18. *Phil.* 2.

3. His ſatisfaction is diſtinguiſhed from this righteouſneſſe, when I think it is plain, that it ſelf is righteouſneſſe; Chriſts own as a Redeemer; Ours as redeemed ones; when Chriſt had taken upon him our ſins, he had not ſtood righteous in Gods ſight, without a diſcharge, and this diſcharge is our acquittal and deliverance.

Queries put concerning this righteouſneſſe.

4. We hear not whence this righteouſneſſe thus merited, is; where it reſides, and how made ours. Is it a righteouſneſſe by a new Creation? as the light was once made to ſhine out of darkneſſe; was it put immediately into Chriſt, or given immediately to us? which ſeems to be Mr. *Baxters* thoughts to avoid periſhing of accidents. Is it one gift indefinitely at once for all, or to all? or is it given particularly, numerically, individually? Is it made ours without us, or by us? If it be made ours, whether

ther is it by our acceptation through faith, or ability merited for us to work it? and ſo Chriſt merited that we might merit.

2. *It muſt needs be known* (ſaith he) *that the faith which is the juſtifying condition, is terminated on Chriſt himſelf, as the object, and not on his righteouſneſſe which he gives us in remiſſion; remiſſion, or righteouſneſſe may be the end of the ſinner in receiving Chriſt; but righteouſneſſe or remiſſion is not the object received by that act which is made the condition of juſtification; or at leaſt but a ſecondary more remote object*, &c. In this whole piece we have an affirmation, a negation, a conceſſion and illuſtration. For the affirmation, that faith is terminated on Chriſt, we grant; but that it is not therefore terminated on the righteouſneſſe which he gives in remiſſion, (for remiſſion I think was intended) we are to learn: And when it is granted, that remiſſion is the end, (which is ill confounded with righteouſneſſe, one being the cauſe, the other the effect) it muſt be granted, that a righteous Chriſt is the object, and that Chriſt is received upon account of his righteouſneſſe; were not this an *accurate* way of diſtinguiſhing, to ſay, that a man ready to periſh with cold, goes to the fire, and not to heat, for warmth; The heart ready to periſh with thirſt; goeth to the water, and not to moiſture; If the ſoul ready to periſh in unrighteouſneſſe, goes to Chriſt for righteouſneſſe, his faith cannot be terminated on Chriſt, but it muſt be terminated on righteouſneſſe, as the eye cannot be fixed on the ſunne, but it muſt be fixed on light. We are holpen with a ſimilitude. *As a woman doth not marry a mans riches, but the man; Though it may be her end in marrying the man, to be enriched by him; nor is her receiving his riches the condition of her firſt Legal right to them, but her taking the man for her huſband.* If Chriſt and righteouſneſſe were ſeparable, as a man and riches are, this ſimile might be to ſome purpoſe, ſo that a man might be married, and poverty continued; but Chriſt cannot be received and a ſtate of unrighteouſneſſe remain. It is ſaid, *Receiving the perſons into relation, from whom we expect the benefit, goes before the receiving the benefit by them, which is uſually the remote end, and not the object of that firſt reception, which is the condition.* Which may be true where perſon and benefit are ſeparable; but I cannot receive a woman in marriage, and a wife after. As an eternal increated righteouſneſſe is eſſential to Chriſt, as God; and the quality

Our Faith being terminated on Chriſt, it is terminated on righteouſneſſe.

quality of righteousnesse, connatural as man; so a righteousnesse to constitute others righteous is essential to Christ *qua* Mediator; without such a righteousnesse, he is no high Priest for us, and therefore his righteousnesse, as Mediator was before very harshly called an accident. It followes, *Our Divines therefore of the Assembly do perfectly define justifying faith, to be receiving and resting on Christ alone for salvation, as he is offere d in tGospel.* And is he offered in the Gospel without a righteousnesse being offered in the Gospel as Mediatour, and righteousnesse essentially necessary in a Mediatour, resting on Christ, we rest on righteousnesse.

To receive a righteousnesse for justification is no fancy or delusion.

3. *In my judgement* (saith he) *it is a meer fancy and delusion to speak of the receiving a righteousnesse, that we may be justified constitutive thereby in such a sense, at if the righteousnesse were first to be made ours, in order of nature before our justification, and then justification follow, because we are righteous, and so these were two things; for to receive righteousnesse, and to receive justification is one thing. Gods justifying us, and pardoning our sin, and his constituting us righteous, and his giving us righteousnesse is all one thing, under several notions.* If it be granted, that justification is *verbum forense*, borrowed from proceeding in Courts of justice, and holds out our acquittal, or discharge from sentence, and not making us formally just, then it is no fancy, or delusion, to say that we receive a righteousnesse to be justified, but dangerous (as I think) to deny it; if righteousnesse and justification be one thing, then that is a tautology, *Deut.* 25. 1. ye *shall justifie the righteous, and condemn the wicked.* Though it is impossible that God should condemn a just, and justifie a wicked person, as a man may; yet righteousnesse and justification, as wickednesse and condemnation differ both in God and mans proceedings And righteosnesse is not justification, as wickednesse is not condemnation, sure *Davenant* was high in this fancy and delusion when he thus entituled his 28. Chap. de justitia habituali. *Imputatam Christi obedientiam, esse causam formalem justificationis nostræ probatur.*

4. *Christs satisfaction or redemption* (saith he) *solvendo pretium and merit cannot be properly received by us: for they are not in themselves given to us (but as tropically they may be said to be given to us, because the fruit of them is given us) It was not to us, but to God, that Christ gave satisfaction, and the price of our redempti-*

on

on. And yet juſtifying faith doth as neceſſarily reſpect Chriſts ſatisfaction and merit, as it doth our juſtification thereby procured. It is therefore the acknowledging of this redemption, ſatisfaction or merit, and the receiving of Chriſt as one that hath redeemed us by ſatisfaction and merit, and not the receiving that ſatisfaction or redemption our ſelves, &c. If Chriſt gave ſatisfaction to God, he yet gave it for us, and God accounts it ours: *In him we have redemption through his blood*, Epheſ. 1. 7. If we have it in him, ſome way we come by it. And how we come by it, if we do not receive it, I cannot imagine. As the Sonne gives himſelf for our ranſome to the Father; So the Father gives the Sonne to us. I marvell what comment will be put upon the words of the inſtitution of the Lords Supper, *Take eat this is my body which is broken for you*; as it is broken for us; ſo it is given to us and ſo of the Cup, *This is my blood in the New Teſtament ſhed for you, and for many for the remiſſion of ſins.* Chriſt and ſatisfaction wrought by Chriſt, Chriſt and redemption wrought by Chriſt are both received, ſeeing Chriſt is made unto us redemption, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. and faith is our way of receipt.

How Chriſts ſatisfaction to God for us, is receiued by us.

5. *If faith ſhall be ſaid* (ſaith he) *to be the inſtrument of juſtification* eo nomine *becauſe it is the receiving of that righteouſneſſe wher eby we are juſtified, then it will follow, that faith muſt alſo be called the inſtrument of our enjoying Chriſt* eo nomine *becauſe it receiveth him and the inſtrument of our adoption* eo nomine *becauſe it receiveth adoption, and ſo the ſame act of faith which entitles us to juſtification, doth not entitle us to any other bleſſing; nor that act that entitles us to Chriſt, doth entitle us to juſtification (unleſſe there be ſeveral juſtifying acts) but every particular mercy hath a particular act as the inſtrument of receiving it, which is no Scripture doctrine.* Mr. *Baxter* being given to underſtand by a friend, that this is ſcarce intelligible, he hath expreſſed himſelf with more cleerneſſe, in a poſtſcript in this ſyllogiſm. *If the apprehenſion of Chriſts righteouſneſſe, and no other act ſhould ſtrictly be the juſtifying act of faith, and that* eo nomine *becauſe it is the object of that apprehenſion, which is the matter of our juſtification, then it would follow,* 1. *That the apprehenſion of nothing elſe is the juſtifying act.* 2. *And that we have right to every other particular mercy* eo nomine *becauſe we apprehend that mercy, and ſo*

our right to every particular benefit of Christ were received by a distinct act of faith: But the consequent is false: Therefore so is the antecedent. The consequent is here twofold, the first I yield, but deny the second. The apprehension of nothing else is the justifying act, but that there needs distinct acts of faith to receive other mercies, does not follow upon this principle, which Mr. *Baxter* so far as I understand him in the following words hath proved, when it lay on his hand to disprove. Having mentioned several Scriptures, 1 *Joh.* 5. 12. *Joh.* 3. 16. *Joh.* 1. 12. he addes as a result from all, *So that one entire faith is the condition of our right, to all particular benefits.* And he must remember that it is the first according to the tenour of the promise that gives right to all: *He that spared not his own Sonne, but gave him for us, how will he not with him give us all things?* Rom. 8. 32. When the Prophet was to confirm *Ahaz* in the truth of a promise, then to be made good; he holds out to him the promise of the *Messiah*, and onely that promise; which would not have carried strength, but that interest in the first, gives interest in all. *All the promises of God in Christ, being Yea, and Amen,* 2 Cor. 1. 19.

Interest in Christ, gives interest in all other priviledges.

6. *It must be remembred* (saith he) *that the thing that faith receives naturally and properly, is not Christ himself, or his righteousnesse; but the species of what is represented as its object; And that faiths reception of Christ himself, and his righteousnesse, or of right to him, is but receptio metaphorica, vel actio ad receptionem propriam necessaria: and that the true reception which is pati, non agere, doth follow faith. And therefore Christ himself is received, onely Receptione fidei ethicâ, activâ, metaphoricâ: Species Christi prædicati recipitur receptione naturali, intelligendo: Jus ad Christum recipitur receptione naturali passivâ, propriâ.* Mr. *Baxters* friend let him know that he understood not his former, I would I had acquaintance with him to help me in this; for if he had not understood him here, he would likely have said as much as before; unlesse perhaps his modesty would not suffer him to be so much on the excepting hand. That which I think I do understand, I know not how to make to agree: who would not here think, but it were the natural property, or act of faith to receive the *species* of Christ? yet, Sect. 10. pag. 2. he saith, that *every other grace that hath Christ for his object, is thus far an instrument of receiving him* (that is, the species of him, as he expresses

presses himself) *as well as faith, but none so properly as Knowledge*, which also he here (as we see) repeates, *Species Christi prædicati recipitur receptione naturali, intelligendo.* So that faith lesse properly, and not so naturally receives him. Knowledge in this hath the preeminence; who would not think from these words, that it were proper and peculiar to believers thus to receive Christ? yet in the place quoted, pag. 22. it is said, that *he thus dwells in every wicked man that thus thinketh of him.* It seemes then that *Judas* in his thoughts to betray Christ, did as much to this receiving of him, if not more, then others in believing of him. It is there said, that *doubtlesse he doth not dwell in that deep and special manner as in his chosen*; yet if it be most properly by knowledge that he thus dwells, then they that know most have the most deep indwelling, and that is more in devils then in some (if not any) chosen ones. The reception of Christ himself, his righteousnesse, or of right to Christ, is here confest to be an act of faith, and who but Mr. *Baxter* would look for a more true reception? yet *the true reception which is pati, non agere, doth follow faith*; and though the believer receive the actual efficacious gift; yet it is not his faith that receiveth it, as we have in the close of the Paragraph; In his English, he sayes, that *faiths reception of Christ himself, or of right to Christ is but receptio metaphorica*, and *opposed to true reception, which is pati, non agere*: In his Latine he saith, *Jus ad Christum recipitur receptione naturali, passiva, propria*; faith with him is *an acceptance of a freely given Christ, and life in him*; yet a believer receives the efficacious giving, but his faith doth not receive it: I would mind Mr. *Baxter* of that rule of his own, *Ubi lex non distinguit*, &c. and where he meets with these distinctions in the Word of God I know not, and he goes not about to make known. Scripture tells us of receiving Christ by faith, and not of the *species* onely, which an unsanctified knowledge without faith may reach. The *Species* of Christ can neither justifie us, nor pnrifie us, nor yet give victory over the world, nor make resistance against Satan; yet all this through faith Christ doth: and therefore faith doth not receive the bare *species*; if we could be content with Gospel-simplicity, truth might stand, and these distinctions be laid aside.

Scripture speaks of receiving Christ, and not the species of Christ onely.

7. *The great thing therefore that I would desire to be observed is this; that though faith were an instrument of the aforesaid ob-*

jective, or of the ethical, metaphorical reception of Christ, (which yet is not properly, being ipsa receptio) yet it is not therefore the instrumental cause of the passive, proper reception of right to Christ, or righteousnesse. Whether we have not that again here denyed, which before was asserted, let the Reader judge. However Reasons are given of it;

Faith is an instrument of the proper reception of Christ.

1. In the negative: *Of this* (saith he) *it is onely the condition and not the proper instrument*, with an objection prevented in a parenthesis; *I shall shew hereafter that it is impossible to be both.* I shall wait therefore till this be shewen, for I despair I confesse ever to see such impossibility; I know an instrument, *quâ* instrument differs from a condition, *quâ* a condition, but that one and the same thing is in an utter incapacity to be both an instrument and an instrumental condition, I do not believe. I may give a man a piece of money with a proviso, that he take it in a sawcer, or a pair of tonges, this now is the condition, yet the tonges or sawcers are his instruments to receive it.

Faith doth more then morally qualifie the subject to be a fit patient to be justified.

2. We have a positive reason: *It doth morally qualifie the subject to be a fit patient to be justified, as* Mr. Benjam. Woodbridge *saith truly in his excellent Sermon of Justification.* I have not this Sermon, though I know that he hath often applauded it; but how excellent soever, I had rather have had a quotation out of *John's* Gospel, or *Paul's*, *Peters*, or *Johns* Epistles. And if he affirm that which is here quoted out of him, (as I do not question) I hope to dye in a different opinion from him. This subject that is onely morally qualified to be a fit patient to be justified, is not yet in possession of Christ, or life by Christ; Mr. *Baxter* is morally qualified for the degree of Doctor, and yet he is no Doctor; was morally qualified to be called by the State for consultation about Religion; when as yet he was not called, and might have dyed, and never have been called; but faith puts into an actual possession of Christ, and Justification by him. By him all that believe are justified from all things. I should rather take Humiliation, Conviction, Compunction, soul-emptinesse, to be such moral qualification as is here mentioned; and this I have learnt from our Saviour, *Matth.* 11. 28. *Come unto me all ye that labour, and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest.* Such are morally qualified for the justified mans rest and peace; And more fully in the Parable, *Luk.* 18. the Publicane that came not with a list of vertues as the Pharisee did, but was so

ſo clogged with ſin, that he ſtood afar off from the mercy-ſeat, durſt not lift up his eyes to heaven, ſeeing a large liſt of ſins, and not of vertues, or praiſe-worthy carriages, goes away juſtified rather then the Phariſee. Here is a ſubject morally qualified to be a fit patient to be juſtified, not yet actually juſtified, (which alſo was their caſe, *Acts* 2. 37. with the Jaylours, *Act.* 16. 30.) which I think neither Mr. *Baxter* nor Mr. *Woodbridge* can find affirmed of any actually in the faith, who according to Scripture are actually juſtified, and not barely qualified to be fit patients in due time to receive it. There followes, I would have *Pareus* here put againſt this which is quoted out of Mr. *Woodbridge*; ſpeaking by way of objection againſt the Orthodox doctrine of Juſtification, he ſaith, *Faith juſtifies, that is, it diſpoſes or fits for juſtification*; and anſwers, *A wreſted gloſſe; unknown to Scripture, and contrary to it: For faith is ſaid to juſtifie by receiving the gift of righteouſneſſe, without works, and not by diſpoſing for righteouſneſſe. Neither is juſtification by motion, as is warmth, but by imputation. And if it were by motion, it were moſt improperly aſcrib'd to faith. Neither is motion to a thing, the thing it ſelf: nor doth a diſpoſition obtain any thing, but is the way to obtain it: Therefore faith do's not juſtifie by any motion of diſpoſition*, Pareus in Rom 3. Dub. 8. The reaſon of this is, *That this is onely donation, or the will of the donour ſignified, that can efficiently convey a right to his own benefits; the receiver is not the giver, and therefore not the conveyer of right.* I wonder what this is a reaſon of; if it be intended for a reaſon of that which goeth immediately before, that faith doth morally qualifie in the way mentioned, it is above me to ſee any reaſon in it. It is further ſaid, *Every inſtrument is an efficient cauſe, and therefore muſt effect; and it is onely giving that effecteth this right.* But it effects no ſuch right without receiving, where it is given upon that proviſo, that it be thus and thus received. After much ado, and to what purpoſe, let others judge. The concluſion is: *The great thing therefore that I affirm is this, that if you will needs call faith the inſtrument of apprehending Chriſt, or righteouſneſſe, yet doth it not juſtifie proxime & formaliter*

Fides juſtificat, i. e. diſponit ad juſtitiam. Reſpondeo: Gloſſa contorta Scripturæ ignota et repugnans. Juſtificare enim dicitur fides accipiendo donum juſtitiæ abſq; operibus, non diſponendo ad juſtitiam. Nec juſtificatio fit per motum, ſicut calefactio, ſed per imputationem. Quod ſi fieret per motum, admodum imp oprie fidei tribueretur. Neq; enim motus ad rem eſt res ipſa, nec diſpoſitio generat, ſed eſt via ad generationem. Non igitur per motum diſpoſitionis fides juſtificat——.

liter as ſuch, but as the condition of the gift performed. And the great thing that I would affirm, is, That the inſtrumental apprehending Chriſt, or righteouſneſſe, is this condition of the gift; It is given upon condition that we make uſe of our faith to apprehend it; and ſo the ſumme is, That faith doth not juſtifie *formaliter & proxime*, as apprehending Chriſt, or righteouſneſſe, becauſe it doth juſtifie *proxime & formaliter* as thus apprehending. Faith as a condition certainly doth ſomewhat, and this it is that it doth according to the Scripture.

The eighth and laſt of his *accurate* heads followes. In which he ſaies, he opens his meaning together, about this point, though as he ſaies with ſome repetitions. I cannot then without repetitions give any further anſwer, which to the Reader would be too troubleſome, yet ſomewhat is obſervable that I find not before. *Faith* (ſaith he) *muſt firſt be faith*, i. e. *apprehenſio Chriſti, in order of nature before it can be the condition of right.* If faith muſt have an actual being before it can be the condition of right, then perfect obedience (according to the old rule, as Mr. *Baxter* calls it) muſt firſt be perfect obedience in actual being, before it can be a condition of the Covenant of works, and ſo it will follow that, that Covenant hath no condition, ſeeing there is no ſuch actual obedience. A condition may be a condition, though not made good, though never made good. The delivery in of an hundred foreskins of the Philiſtines was *Davids* condition for Marriage of *Sauls* daughter before any Philiſtine was ſlain, and had ſtood as a condition though had never been given in. If he mean, that faith muſt be faith, before the condition be made good, this is falſe: for the actual being of it is the making of it good; and ſo it is as much as if I ſaid, I muſt wink in order of nature before I ſhut my eyes. He further diſtinguiſhes of *apprehenſio Chriſti*, and *conditio præſtita*, when *apprehenſio Chriſti* is *conditio præſtita*; as though I ſhould diſtinguiſh between *Abrahams* ſacrificing of his ſon, and his obedience of Gods command in ſacrificing him, when all know that his ſacrificing him was his obedience. To ſay that there is ſuch a thing as faith in the general notion before Chriſt doth conſtitute a condition, were ſomewhat; but to ſay that we believe, or apprehend Chriſt before we perform the condition, is to ſay we muſt perform the condition before we perform it.

Actual exiſtence not neceſſary to the being of a condition in a Covenant.

Having led the Reader through all this *accurateneſſe*, I muſt further

further conſider his animadverſions. I ſaid, [The Spirit will do nothing without our faith, and our faith can do nothing without the Spirit; man cannot juſtifie himſelf by believing without God, and God will not juſtifie an unbelieving man; faith then is the act of man; man believes, yet the inſtrument of God that juſtifies onely believers.] To which I have a multiplication either of anſwers and ſcornes in place of anſwers. 1. It is ſaid. *The Spirits working in ſanctification is nothing to our queſtion of juſtification.* It is yet ſomewhat for illuſtration, for which alone it was brought, though nothing for proof for which it was never intended. 2. It is ſaid. *The Spirit works our firſt faith without faiths coworking, and that is more then nothing.* What need he to have told me this, when I had told it him before? as the Reader may ſee in words which he omits; I ſpeak there of the Spirits work in the ſoul where faith is implanted. 3. *The Spirit moveth faith to action before faith moveth it ſelf.* Here is an exception to fill up the number. If I move my pen to write, before it move, then I write ſomething without my pen. 4. It is ſaid. *It is not ſo eaſily proved as ſaid, That the Spirit never exciteth any good act in the ſoul, nor yet reſtraineth from any evill without the coworking of faith.* But why is not this diſproved with eaſe? I would know for my learning, what act of the Spirit upon a beleeving ſoul is mentioned in Scripture, which is not aſcribed alſo to faith. The Spirit mortifies the deeds of the fleſh, ſo doth faith, *Acts* 15. 9. Devils are caſt out by the Spirit of God, ſo they are caſt out by faith, *Mar.* 9 The Spirit is our ſtrength in the inward man, *Epheſ.* 3. 16. and faith is our ſtrength, 1 *Pet.* 5. 9. *Rom.* 4. 20. All things are poſſible to the Spirit of God; And all things are poſſible to him that beleeves, *Mar.* 9. 23. The Spirits method laid down in the Word is not to work in us reſpective to ſalvation (after the grace of faith is implanted) without us; what is aſcribed to the one as the efficient, is ordinary aſcribed to the other as the inſtrument. But theſe anſwers he confeſſes are beſides the point; This ſimile might therefore have eſcaped this quarrel; in the two next he will ſure then be ſo punctual, that all Readers ſhall ſay, *Rem acu tetigiſti.* 5. It is added. *When you have laid down one propoſition, Man cannot juſtifie himſelf by believing without God, how fairly do you lay down this as the diſjunct propoſition? And God will not juſtifie an unbelieving man, who would have thought, but you would rather have ſaid, Nor will God juſtify*

man

man unlesse his faith be the instrument of it? and do you not seem to imply that man without God, doth justifie himself, when you say man cannot justifie himself by believing without God? No, nor with him neither, for none can forgive sins but God onely, even to another; but who can forgive himself? I think all is laid down so fairly, that were I to lay it down again, I should not lay it down in Mr. *Baxters* words. *Nor will God justifie a man unlesse faith be the instrument*, he would then soon have challenged it as a *petitio principii*, seeing it is that which is in question; I might have said that God will not justify a man except he disclaim his own righteousnesse, and accept of Christs righteousnesse to justification; but that which I did say is the same with any friend, or fair adversary, and so it is a disjunct proposition fairly laid down, and I imply that which I speak; and if any will have it further expressed, God will not justifie man without the concurrence of his faith. There followes; *In deed I have thought what a sad case the Pope is in, that is the onely man on earth that hath no visible pardoner of his sin: he can forgive others; but who shall forgive him?* It seems by this jest that Mr. *Baxter* is willing to put off that he is not so good a proficient in Popish mysteries, as by Mr *Crandon* he stands charged; otherwise he could not but know that the Pope hath his pardoner as well as others. He gives power for the pardon of sin, as the supposed head of the Church, by application of the supererogated merits of the Saints, together with the merits of Christ, out of the treasure of the Church, of which he hath the keys. Now he sinnes as a man, and receives pardon as a Church-member, and to that purpose hath his confessor, A man as visible as other men. And speaking of his sad condition on this supposition, he seems to lay farre more stresse on the pardons of Rome then they themselves; as though he stood in some eminent danger of hell upon the want of such a pardon, when he might know that according to their principles, all his danger is, an abode some longer time in Purgatory, which is their trimming place in the way to heaven. For if the pardon find him in a mortal sinne (which alone is deserving of hell) it is altogether inefficacious; mortall sinne puts a barre to the working of it. It is the temporal punishment which this pardon remits, and not the eternal; and in case it were true that this could not be done to the Pope, there being none above him, his successor with a wet finger can do it for him.

The Pope hath his visible pardoner as well as receivers.

As

As to that which was forgotten, it had been to his honour if it had never been remembred. *I forgot* (ſaith he) *that every believer forgiveth himſelf, for I did not believe it.* Such ſarcaſmes befit not grave Writers, eſpecially when all *Reformers* (to ſpeak in his own language) muſt bear a ſhare in the contumely; when they had it in their thoughts, in this way to imitate the Apoſtle in giving all to grace, and taking all from man, that one would riſe out of themſelves to make this ſport with it. It followes, 6. *How nakedly is it again affirmed without the leaſt proof, that our faith is Gods inſtrument in juſtifying? doth God effect our Juſtification by the inſtrumental efficient cauſation of our faith?* If this were my fault, yet Mr. *Baxter* of all men is moſt unfit to give it in charge; other men muſt have a proof for every word, but he himſelf may heap up diſtinctions, propoſitions, concluſions, without any colour of proof at all: where is his proof of that which in the laſt Section, number 6. *muſt be remembred?* and of that *great thing*, num. 7. he would deſire ſhould be obſerved? I ſuppoſe he will have ten to remember, and obſerve, before one to believe it. Others can ſee proof, and ſend their Reader hither for proof, though he cannot find it. My work was to ſhew, that though it be mans act, yet God may make uſe of it as inſtrumentally ſerviceable in this work; and whether this hath been nakedly ſaid, or proved, let the diſ-intereſted Reader give his ſentence; if that which I have ſaid will not ſatisfie, let Mr. *Burges* be conſulted in his late Treatiſe of Juſtifica. Part 2. I conclude, [That which is here ſpoken by way of exception againſt faith as an inſtrument, holds of efficients and inſtruments ſole and abſolute in their work and cauſality; but where there is a concurrence of agents, and one makes uſe of the act of another to produce the effect that in ſuch cauſality is wrought, it will not hold.] To this is anſwered, *He that will or can make him a Religion of words or ſyllables, that either ſigniſie nothing, or are never like to be underſtood by the learner, let him make this an article of his faith, what you mean by abſolute, I cannot certainly ariolate. Bona verba bono viro deſunt.* Seeing I find the man in this mood, I ſay no more; but ſeeing he knowes not how to ariolate, what I mean by this, or that, I have no mind to help him in this art of ſoothſaying, and ſhall let the words ſtand for their uſe, that bring a mind to underſtand, rather then to exerciſe their wit to carp at what they read.

Of the ſoleſufficiency of the grant of the new Covenant, as an inſtrument in juſtification.

I ſhall now leave to the Readers conſideration, whether Mr. *Baxters* exceptions againſt the inſtrumentality of faith in juſtification, be of that validity, as to overthrow it, and whether his doctrine of this ſubject be of that clearneſſe, as to accuſe the doctrine of his adverſaries (which are all *Reformers*; Forreign, and Engliſh) of ſuch notable obſcurity. I muſt now look into that which he hath ſaid; for the ſole-ſufficiency of the grant of the new Covenant of the Goſpel to ſtand in ſtead of faith for an inſtrument in this work. And if I meet with no more ſatisfaction in this, then in the former; I muſt crave leave to ſay, that I have very little in either. I ſaid in my Treatiſe of the Covenant. [The promiſe or grant of the new Covenant in the Goſpel, is inſtead of faith made the inſtrument in the work of juſtification] adding, [This is indeed Gods, and not mans: It is the Covenant of God, the promiſe of God, the Goſpel of God: but of it ſelf unable to raiſe up man to juſtification.] To which Mr. *Baxter* replyes: *I ſay there is none but Gods, for* non datur inſtrumentum, quod non eſt cauſæ principalis inſtrumentum. And I ſay ſtill that God acts not in this work, without the concurrence of him that is juſtified, which Mr. *Baxter* grants; And this concurrence of man having its inſtrument, God thereby doth carry on his work; otherwiſe the Apoſtle had not onely ſaid, that *God is a juſtifier, of thoſe that believe in Jeſus*, Rom. 3.26. but alſo that *he juſtifies the circumciſion by faith, and the uncircumſion through faith.* And this act of man is *interpretativè*, the inſtrument of God, but more directly and properly the inſtrument of man; where I ſay it is of it ſelf unable to raiſe up man to juſtification; he gives in his anſwer. In which we have: Firſt, his conceſſion, what of it ſelf it is not able to do. Secondly, his aſſertion, what of it ſelf it can do. Thirdly, his explication under what notion it doth it. His conceſſion is, *That it is not of it ſelf able to do all other works antecedent to juſtification, as to humble, to give faith, regenerate, &c.* But he doth not tell us from whence it hath any ſupply for thoſe antedaneous works, or whether it be employed in thoſe works at all. His aſſertion is, that *as to the act of juſtification, or conveying right to Chriſt, pardon, and righteouſneſſe, it is able of it ſelf.* But it is worth our enquiry, to whom

In juſtification of man, God acts not without man.

Mr. *Baxters* conceſſion.

His aſſertion.

whom this new Covenant grant doth convey right to Chriſt, pardon, and righteouſneſſe, whether to the unhumbled, unbelieving, unregenerate, or to the humble, believing, and regenerate ſoul? The former are not in a preſent capacity of him, and the latter are already in poſſeſſion; if he can find me an humble, believing, regenerate man void of all right to Chriſt, pardon, and righteouſneſſe, I will confeſſe that the grant of the new Covenant is of it ſelf able to do what Mr. *Baxter* ſayes. I looked that he ſhould have proved, that the grant of the new Covenant in the Goſpel doth this *conſtitutivè* as he uſeth to ſpeak, That it ſhould work an unjuſtified man up to a juſtified ſtate; but it ſeems he will have it to do it onely *declarativè*, to make it appear that he is already juſtified, which honour is very low, and that about which I intend not to raiſe diſputes; If I miſtake him, and that he will ſay, that he means more then a naked declaration. I would he would explaine himſelf and ſpeak out what more it is that he intends; for if he intend more, I know not how to help him out of an high contradiction, ſeeing he talkes of conveyance of right to them that all know are poſſeſſed beforehand of right. The ſame Goſpel-grant which works thoſe antecedaneous acts of which he ſpeaks, doth together convey right to all thoſe in whom ſuch a work is found. It is able to do it of it ſelf (as he explaines himſelf) *ut ſignum voluntatis divinæ*, but where is it revealed from God, that either the unhumbled, unbelieving, unregenerate, ſhall have right to Chriſt, pardon, juſtification, or that the humble, believing, regenerate want it? Faith with Mr. *Baxter* is *an acceptance of a freely given Chriſt, and life in him*, how then doth a man in faith ſtand in need of a new conveyance of right to him? There followes; *If you ſhould mean that* [*that of it ſelf*] *i. e. without the concomitance of faith as a condition is not able*; I anſwer, *that is not fitly called diſability; or if you will ſo call it, the reaſon of that diſability is not, becauſe there is a neceſſity of faiths inſtrumentall coefficiency, but of its preſence, as the performed condition: It being the will of the donor that his grant ſhould not efficere actualites till the condition were performed.* This aſſertion, That there is no efficiency in faith, but a naked preſence to ſtand by, and as it were to look on in the work of juſtification, calls for ſome proof: ſeeing he well knowes that among all *Reformers* his adverſaries, this will paſſe for ſo high a Paradox. How is Chriſt *a propitiation through faith?*

faith? and how are we still said to be justified by faith? If no more then a bare presence is required, the presence of other graces is equally required; as love, meekness, temperance, chastity, they have still been confest necessary in justification, *quoad presentiam*, though not *quoad efficientiam*: yet Mr. *Baxter* can I think, no where shew, that Christ is set forth a propitiation through any one of these graces: or that we are justified by love, meekness, temperance, &c. I shall as soon believe that the presence of the eye is barely required for sight, without further efficiency, as I shall believe that the bare presence of faith is required, and no more for justification: and where he will prove that it is the will of the Donor, that his grant should not *efficere actualiter* till the condition be performed, (intending as he expresseth himself, that after the condition is performed a new grant must passe actualy to effect this right) I cannot tell, when the condition is to accept Christt which is present possession. They cannot take Christ for justification, but by virtue of this grant: and when they have thus taken him, and are possest of him, must they have a new grant for right to him? If I give a begger a gift, upon condition that he will come, and take it: when he hath taken it, and is possest of it, hath he need of any further grant of right to it? I said, [It is often tendered, and justification not alwayes wrought, and so disabled from the office of an instrument by *Keckerman*, in his Comment on his first Canon concerning an instrument; As soon as the instrument serves not the principal agent, so soon it loseth the nature of an instrument,] mentioning instances that he gives, and adding, neither is the Gospel an instrument of justification where it justifies not. Mr. *Baxter* being gotten into a vein that he hath not yet a mind to leave, replyes; *I am too shallow to reach the reason of these words; I know you had not leisure to write them in vain, and meerly to fill paper.* 1. I may fear there was a worse end in the reply, then barely to fill paper: In contentions of this nature it is easie for great wits, voluble tongues, and nimble pens, to be more then vain. And here is scarce fair declaring to cut off my words before any full period, and so render them to the Reader; That my meaning cannot be seen, till he have gone over three or four Sections interlaced with needlesse triflings. 2. If Mr. *Baxter* know (as he sayes) that I will not own such an argumentation as he there frames, without so much as colour of sense in it, which were vain

to

to repeat, what was his end, but meerly to fill up paper, or ſomewhat worſe, in framing of it? A Reader of half Mr. *Baxters* wit, if he look on my words as they lye in my Treatiſe, and not as mangled by his diviſions, may eaſily ſee another way of argumentation, and ſuch that carries ſenſe; and I leave to the Reader, whether or no it carries ſtrength. And for his ſatisfaction, I thus put it into forme. That which often failes of obtaining the end, for which it is employed, and never can attain to it, without the concurrence of ſome other with it, is no ſole inſtrument in any work: But the Goſpel or Covenant-grant often failes of attaining that end of juſtification, when it is to that end publiſhed, and imployed, and never can obtain it without the concurrence of ſomewhat further to be joyned with it: *Ergo* it is no ſole inſtrument in the work. Mr. *Br.* ſignifies that it may ſtill be the ſame thing, and have the ſame aptitude to produce the effect, even when it is not applyed. I anſwer, then Mr. *Kendall* hath well told him it is an inſtrument *aptitudinaliter*, and is no inſtrument in actual being, but when the end is obtained, and then it is no ſole inſtrument, being not ſole in producing the effect. Mr. *Baxter* takes it for granted, that it alwayes hath its effect when it is employed, and I took it for granted, that it is often employed, and the effect not produced; but I did not then think, that Mr. *Baxter* had meant an application to convey right, where right is already in poſſeſſion. I added, [When the Miniſter is a Miniſter of condemnation, and the ſavour of death to death, there the Goſpel becomes an inſtrument of condemnation and death, and ſo comes ſhort of juſtification.] To this is replyed, 1. *So it is, if there be no Miniſter where it is known any way.* 2. *I ſpeak of Gods grant, or promiſe in the Goſpel: you ſpeak of his commination.* 3. *If the threat be the proper inſtrument of condemnation à pari, the promiſe, or gift is the proper inſtrument of juſtification.* I grant his firſt, and he threapes kindneſſe with me in the two laſt; he will have me to ſpeak of the threat onely, when I ſpeak as well as he of Gods grant or promiſe: This is a ſavour of death unto death unto many. It is as great an evil to ſleight a Promiſe, as to diſobey a Command, or neglect a threatning: his third therefore might well have been ſpared: but that I intend not to trifle away time, I could eaſily ſhew him if I had ſpoke of a threat, a great diſparity. I added, (which ſhould not have come in thus diſmembred) [The efficacy that is in the Goſpel

The Authors argument againſt the ſole-ſufficiency of Covenant grace, as an inſtrument in juſtification.

Goſpel promiſes are a ſavour of death to many.

pel for juſtification it receives by their faith to whom it is tendred.]To this is replyed, *Darkly, but dangerouſly ſpoken*, and reaſons given. *For it is poſſible you may mean, that it receives it by faith, as by a condition*, ſine qua homo non eſt ſubjuctum proxime capax, *and ſo I grant the ſenſe.* There is no poſſiblity, that I ſhould mean ſo, having ſufficiently (as he after obſerves) declared my ſelf to the contrary, if I underſtand his *ſine qua non* frequently found in his writings; which men eminently learned profeſſe they do not. It followes, *Dangerouſly; for the words would ſeem to any impartial Reader to import more*, viz. *That the Goſpel receives its efficacy from faith, or by faith as the inſtrument which conveyeth that efficacy to the Goſpel.* It is my meaning that the word is inefficacious without faith, and that faith renders it efficacious, not by infuſion of any new power into it, but raiſing up the ſoul with ſtrength to anſwer it, which is not barely ſaid, but proved: But my bare ſpeech muſt firſt be cenſured, and then my proof in a diſjunct way at pleaſure (as we ſhall ſee) dealt with. A reaſon is rendred, why for the truths ſake, and my own, theſe words have never been ſeen. *For if faith give the Goſpel its efficacy*, 1. *It cannot be as a concauſe inſtrumental, coordinate, but as a ſuperiour more principal cauſe to the ſubordinate.* By Mr. *Baxters* leave I do believe that concauſes inſtrumental may receive efficacy one from another. The thred hath efficacy from a needle, and is a concauſe inſtrumental to ſow up a rent, or to make a ſeam or hem. The line gives efficacy to the anglers hook to take a fiſh. I believe he hath ſeen a knife touched with a Loadſtone, fetch up a needle from the bottome of a veſſel of water. Here the hand is the principall agent, or the man uſing his hand: The knife is the inſtrument, yet ſuch an inſtrument as receives efficacy from the ſpirits of the Loadſtone, as a concauſe inſtrumental. The Goſpel works no more without faith, then a knife in this thing can work without a Loadſtone. It followes, 2. *If it were the former that is meant, yet it were intolerable*; For which reaſons are given; but how theſe hang together, I know not. His former (now ſpoken to) was brought in as the firſt in order to diſprove what I had ſaid, taking my words in the ſecond ſenſe which he gives of them; and this which is in order the ſecond, is to ſhew by three reaſons, that in caſe they be taken in the firſt ſenſe, which he himſelf profeſſedly grants, yet it were intolerable; ſeeing therefore that I take

take it not in that ſenſe, (and if I did, he grants the ſenſe) there is no cauſe that I ſhould trouble my ſelf with his Reaſons. I added, in way of proof, [*Heb.* 4. 2. Unto us was the Goſpel preached, &c. 1 *Theſſ.* 2. 12, 13.] To which is replyed, *But where's your concluſion, or any ſhew of advantage to your cauſe?* I muſt ſpeak nothing, it ſeems, but ſyllogiſmes in form; and he that cannot here make up a ſyllogiſme, and find out a formall concluſion, is a very Infant in Logick. *In the firſt Text, the Apoſtle* (as he ſayes) *ſpeaks of the Words profiting in the reall change of the ſoul, and our queſtion is of the relative.* And what ſhew of proof is there, that it is ſo underſtood of a real change, as wholly to exclude that which is relative? It is meant of that, whatſoever, which tends to the ſoules profit; It is ſpoken of profit in order to eternal reſt; If Juſtification be for our profit, or tend at all to our everlaſting reſt, then juſtification is not here excluded. It followes, *The Scripture meaneth, The Word had not further work on the heart as it hath in them that mix it with faith; will you interpret it thus, The Word did not juſtifie?* If I take this to be the meaning, I muſt interpret it, That the Word did not juſtifie them; for it doth juſtifie where it is mixt with faith, though I ſhould not exclude other offices done by the Word. It followes, 2. *It's true that the Word did not juſtifie them, but that is conſequential onely of the former unprofitableneſſe.* I might as well ſay, that the Word's not ſanctifying is conſequential; as he may ſay, the Word's not juſtifying is onely thus conſequential. I ſee no ſhew of reaſon, that the Text ſhould be meant immediately of ſanctification, and conſequentially onely of Juſtification; and if it be conſequentially onely proved, that the Word did not juſtifie Them, here is a reall, and more then a ſhew of advantage to my cauſe. I hope he is not the man that will diſpute againſt proofs by conſequence, when the conſequence by himſelf is granted. It followes; *Once prove that man is but as much efficient in juſtifying himſelf, as he is in the obedience and change of his mind or actions, and then you do ſomething.* When I go about the proof of it, I think I ſhall have Mr. *Baxter* my ſole and ſingle adverſary in it, he is not pleaſed to give us in any difference. And he owns that which is uſually quoted out of *Auſtin, He that made thee without thee, will not ſave thee without thee*; and hath not juſtification as great an influx into ſalvation, as ſanctification? I de-

Heb. 4. 2. vindicated.

ſire

sire him onely to reflect upon that which he hath said in the Preface of his confession, (a book newly come to my hands) *Antecedently to believing all have an equal conditional gift of pardon, and none have an absolute, nor an actual right; The Gospel findeth us equal, and makes no inequality, till we make it our selves; But the secret unsearchable workings of Divine grace do begin the difference, and make it in us, before it be made by us.* Who ever went higher in speaking of mans work in his sanctification? and higher it is, then ever I spake of a mans pardoning himself. It is said, *It is weak arguing, to say the Word profiteth not, because it was not mixt with faith, therefore faith conveyes to it its efficacy of sanctifying, yea, of justifying, you cannot but know the sequel would be denyed.* Others would think, that there is strength in such arguing, that it receives efficacy from faith, upon that account, that it profits where faith is, and is unprofitable where faith is not; especially when they find efficacy ascribed to faith both in justification and sanctification. It followes, *In progressive sanctification, and obedience, and exercise of graces, the Word and faith are concauses, and one will not effect without the other.* And are not the Word and faith concauses in Justification, as in progressive sanctification? tell us whether you will exclude? I dare exclude neither faith nor Gospel, as instrumental workers. *But it followes not,* as is said, *that therefore faith gives efficacy to the Word in this, for concauses have not influence on each other, but on the effect.* I scarce think that maxime to be of universal truth; but be it a truth, I say no more, then here is asserted for me; Justification is the effect, and the Word and faith are concauses. It yet followes, *The want of faith may hinder the Word from that further work on the soul, which presupposeth faith, and that's all that the Text saith.* If any sense can be made of this arguing, so far as I understand it, then Justification presupposeth not faith, which is not Mr. *Baxters* judgment. It followes, *May not the absence of faith hinder, unlesse when present it doth effect?* And would the Apostle (think we) have spoke of effectual faith, or the efficacy of faith? yea, would Dr. *Preston* have wrote a Tract of effectual faith, if it had been idle in the soul, and without all efficacy? And to restrain the efficacy of it to sanctification, excluding Justification, never came, that I know, into the thoughts of any Orthodox Writer, that hath treated of Justification; neither would the Pen-men of Scriptures have expres-

sed

ſed themſelves in that way; as to ſay we are *juſtified by faith*, had faith been there, and onely had ſate idle. The various applications of that Text, *Hab.* 2. 4. [*The juſt ſhall live by his faith*] may teach us, not to pen up faith in ſuch narrow bounds, as to reſtrain the work of it to efficacy in one kind onely. The Apoſtle to the *Hebrewes* plainly applyes it to ſupport by faith in ſufferings, *Heb.* 10. 38. and *Gal.* 3. 11. to juſtification by faith; and ſhall we ſay, that in the one, it is working; and in the other, it doth nothing? If we do, we ſhall have *Paul* our adverſary, who ſayes that Chriſt is ſet forth a propitiation *by faith:* what followes, hath been already ſpoken to. *The ſecond Text*, ſaith he, *I know not how you mean to make uſe of, unleſſe you argue thus, The Word worketh effectually onely in believers, therefore faith conveyeth efficacy to the Word. I think I need not tell you*, (ſaith he) *that I deny the ſequel; not to ſpeak of the antecedent, nor yet to tell you that this ſpeaks not of working the relative change of juſtification*: He had a good mind to ſpeak to the antecedent, but if he can for diſproof of that, make any efficacious working of the Word appear in Infidels, ſuch as Scripture uſeth to honour with ſuch titles, I ſhall oppoſe him, to maintain the Juſtification of Infidels. The ſequel in the word [*convey*] is his own; and to that which followes, I have already ſufficiently ſpoken.

I inferred from the former words, that [the Goſpel in it ſelf conſidered, is wanting in that honour aſſigned to an inſtrument, to have influx to the producing of the effect of the principal cauſe, by a proper cauſality. If none dare ſay, that faith hath ſuch an influx, they may much leſſe ſay, that the Word hath ſuch.] This in very big terms is denyed, and the oppoſite boldly aſſerted. *The Goſpel*, ſaith he, *in it ſelf conſidered without the co-ordinate, or ſubordinate, or ſuperior cauſality of faith, hath this honour ſo fully, clearly, beyond all doubt, that no man that is a preacher of this Goſpel ſhould queſtion it.* When I ſtand thus highly charged, to deny that which no Preacher of the Goſpel ſhould queſtion, by reaſon of the clear evidence of it, every man may juſtly expect full, clear, and evident Scriptures, and reaſons, beyond all doubt, for my conviction; but I hear of neither; but inſtead of it, firſt, a piece of a Conceſſion; Secondly, a Simile. The Conceſſion is, *That the Goſpel, without the concomitance of faith doth not actually juſtifie, elſe faith were no condition, or cauſa ſine qua non.*

non. That faith should barely wait, effecting nothing, and gain no further honour then here is assigned, will appear a strange assertion. If it had its efficacy where it was in being in miraculous cures, so that it was said, *Thy faith hath made thee whole*; I think it is much rather efficacious in justification, there being so much spoken of justification *by faith*. I desire Mr. *Baxter* to consider the words of his learned dying friend Mr. *Gataker*, in his letter to him. *And surely faith as a medium, seems to have a more peculiar office in the transaction of that main businesse of Justification, then either repentance, or any other grace, as the love, or fear of God, and the like. Which to me, seems the more apparent, because I find it so oft said in the Word, that men are justified by faith, but no where by repentance: Albeit, that also be as a condition thereunto required. as also that form of speech,* πίστις τῷ αἵματι, *fides, or fiducia in sanguine, seems to intimate and imply, that this grace hath a more special reference then any other, to the satisfaction made to Gods Justice for our sins by Christs sufferings, which alone we can plead for our discharge of them at Gods Tribunal:* Much more followes worthy of Mr. *Baxters* consideration, in laying so high a charge as he hath done on our *Reformers* in this particular. There followes a Simile as full of obscurity, as the earth is of darknesse, and it were aesie so far as it is intelligible, to make it appear, how much it halteth; but that I will not trouble the Reader with such impertinencies, and I look for proofs, rather then Similes; and here is no proof at all.

I further infer in my Treatise, [Mr. *Pemble* therefore affirming the Word to be an instrument of Gods Spirit, presently addes, Now instruments are either cooperative, or passive, and the Word must be one of these two. *Cooperative*, he saith, *it is not*; and gives his reason; *It is therefore*, saith he, *a passive instrument working onely per modum objecti, as it containes a declaration of the Divine will, and it proposeth to the understanding and will the things to be known, believed, and practised.*] Here many exceptions are taken.

Whether the Word be a passive instrument, or cooperative with the Spirit.

First, *That Mr.* Pemble *speakes of the Word as the instrument of sanctification; we speak of it, as conveying right to Christ, and as justifying.*

Secondly, *That Mr.* Pembles *reason of the passive instrumentality of the Word is but this, that it cannot be declared, what operative*

rive force there ſhould be in the bare declaration of Gods will.

Thirdly, *That himſelf will undertake to declare that an operation there is by the agency of this declaration, though not punctually how it operates.*

Fourthly, *That this paſſive inſtrumentality of the Word in ſanctifying, doth very ill agree with the language of Scripture, which makes the Word to be mighty, powerful, pulling down ſtrongholds*, &c.

Fifthly, That *Mr. Pemble herein is ſingle and ſingular.*

To ſpeak to theſe in order. To the firſt I ſay, Though Mr. *Pemble* gives an inſtance of the Words work in ſanctification, yet there is no reaſon to believe, that he limits his whole diſcourſe to it, indefinitely affirming that it is a paſſive inſtrument, and giving inſtance in one, there is no imaginable reaſon that he can exclude the other. For his ſecond; He lets his Reader know, that he took an haſty view of Mr. *Pemble*, when he ſaid, that *this was all his reaſon*, he may ſee the thing fully argued by him, *mihi*, pag. 97, 98, 99, &c *in quarto*, which is too long to tranſcribe. The work which is done upon the ſoul is wrought by the Spirit, as the principal agent, whether it be to regeneration, progreſſive ſanctification, or in order to juſtification; every previous work in tendency towards theſe, is from the Spirit likewiſe, as illumination, conviction; the beginning and whole progreſſe is by the Spirit. The Word is no more then an inſtrument, and all that the Word doth, is by power from the Spirit, and therefore ſaid to be mighty *through God*, 2 Cor. 10. 5. Now the Spirit muſt work by way of power, either on the Word, or the ſoul as its object; It muſt infuſe power and ſtrength into the one as the principal agent in the work. Mr. *Pemble* denies, that it works thus by an infuſion of power into the Word, and affirmes that the infuſion of ſtrength is into the ſoul, and not into the Word, which the Apoſtle confirmes, *Epheſ.* 3. 16. As for his third, which he ſaies, he will undertake to declare, he brings nothing but bare authorities; He ſaith, *he hath read many that ſay one thing, and ſome that ſay another, but himſelf is of* Scotus *his mind*, and we have not one ſyllable to induce any other to be of the ſame judgement. His fourth, Mr. *Pemble* anſwers, and ſaith, That, *all thoſe phraſes there reckoned up are to be underſtood by a*

metonymy, which though they properly belong to the invisible power of the Holy Ghost, giving effect unto his own Word, yet are figuratively attributed unto the Word it self, which he useth as his visible instrument, explaining himself by several similitudes. For his last, If Mr. *Pemble* be thus sole and singular, he was much mistaken; Having fully spoke his judgement in this thing, he addes, pag. 99. *And this is the sentence of the Orthodox Church touching the nature and distinction of these two callings, Inward by the work of the Spirit, outward by the voice of the Word. The Arminians are of another opinion, whose judgement* (saith he) *about this matter is thus, &c.* At large laying down their doctrine. And it were easy to multiply those testimonies that take all efficacy or energy from the Word, to give it to the Spirit, usually quoting 1 *Cor.* 3. 6, 7. 2 *Cor.* 3. 6. 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5. He tells me, *I doubt whether you believe him or your self throughly; for if you did, I think you would preach but coldly. I am perswaded you look your preaching should operate actively.* And does he think Mr. *Pemble* did believe his own doctrine, or was he a cold Preacher? he delivers his doctrine with confidence, and backes it with reasons; and the workes that he hath left behind, argue that he spake with some heat, and fervour; and I wish that I could gain more heat both in prayer and preaching, and I do look that my preaching should operate actively; but whether of it self, or through the power of the Spirit, there lyes the question. He concludes, *If it were proved that there were an hundred passive instruments, it would never be proved that faith is one (as an instrument doth signifie an efficient cause) of Gods work of justifying us, neither really, nor reputatively, is it such.* To which I say I read in Divines of a justification active, and that is the work of God, and a justification passive, of which man is the subject; as I read of a double miraculous faith, one active, to work a cure; the other passive, to be cured. *Paul* saw that the Cripple at *Lystra* had faith to be healed, *Acts* 14. 9. Yet I suppose that this is called a passive faith; not that it acted not at all, (which is contradicted by Christ, in saying, *Thy faith hath made thee whole*) but that it served for a passive work on the diseased; so I think this faith which tends to our justification, is not meerly passive, though it serves for such a work as receives that denomination. When I receive a gift that enriches, I act; Yet he that gives, onely does enrich, and I that receive, am enriched; so it is in justification, we do not justifie, but are justified, and yet act in receiving

receiving Chriſt for juſtification, as ſick ones in Chriſts tyme, did not heal, but were healed, yet their faith acted for cure and ours for juſtification. I confeſſe I did ſomewhat needleſſely runne upon this diſcourſe of paſſive inſtruments, upon occaſion of Mr. *Pembles* words, and Mr. *Baxters* denyal that there was any ſuch thing as a paſſive inſtrument, never intending to make faith meerly paſſive; which was never my opinion, neither am I altogether without ſcruple in that which Mr. *Pemble* delivers; yet I would have thoſe that are confidently oppoſite, to weigh the ſtreng[illegible] his reaſons, and find out (if they can) a more moderate middle[illegible] to aſcribe ſomewhat more to the Word, without injury don[illegible] the working of Gods Spirit. I am afraid to utter any thing that may be prejudicial to either, and of two extreames detracting from the Spirit, I take to be the greater; which I leave to the learned after a more full enquiry, further to determine. I am loath to trouble the Reader with that which upon occaſion of ſo[illegible]e paſſages in Mr. *Baxters* Aphoriſmes, I mentioned, that [if *Burgerſdicius* his *gladius* and *culter* be active inſtruments, and *Keckermans incus*, &c. yet it followeth not that there is no paſſive inſtrument;] but onely to rectifie Mr. *Baxters* complaint, that *theſe words do import an intimation* (as he expreſſes it) *that I ſaid all theſe were active inſtruments.* And as the words ſtand in my Book, it is hard to ſay what they import. It ſhonld have been expreſſed, and *Keckermans incus*, &c. and his *ſcamnum*, and *menſa accubitus*, and *terra ambulationis* [no inſtruments] which words, I know not by what meanes were left out; yet the Reader may ſee that they were intended, ſeeing they are oppoſed to the other, which are made active inſtruments. But ſo much is ſpoken of paſſive inſtruments by others, that I may well ſpare my paines; neither is it any way neceſſary for me to ſpeak to them, ſeeing (though I doubt not, but there are thouſands of ſuch kind of inſtruments) I put not faith into that number, as I know many godly learned do: But it is eaſie to bear a diſſent in a word of art, when the thing in queſtion is agreed upon. As to the reſt which followes in this tract againſt me in this thing, there is very little, but what hath been ſpoken to; and this paper already growing more big then is meet for an interpoſition in this kind, in a poſitive Treatiſe (though not impertinent to the ſubject in hand) I am loath to cauſe it to ſwell further with impertinencies; onely I muſt take notice of

two

two passages, one where I am charged with ignorance, the other with complyance with *Rome* in the height of their doctrine of merit. In the first there are several particulars. 1. A charge of misunderstanding Mr. *Br.* when it was hoped, that I had understood better. *I suspect* (saith he) *by your words when you say,* [*the Word is produced and held forth of God,*] *and by your discourse all along, that you understand not what I mean by the Covenants justifying; yet I had hoped you had understood the thing it self.* So [illegible] it is taken for granted, that he cannot be mistaken, when [illegible] truth is known, Mr. *Baxters* writings, and truth are one and the same. 2. My error is detected, and I am sent where I may understand my self better. *You seem to think that the Covenant justifies by some real operation on the soul, as the Papists say, and our Divines say, it sanctifies, or as it doth justifie in* foro Conscientiæ, *by giving assurance, and comfort; but Sir,* (saithhe) *I opened my thoughts fully in Aphoris. pag.* 173, 174, &c. *I scarce bestowed so many words on any one particular point.* But I marvel that it should be expected, that my new learning should be bottomed on his doctrine there delivered, seeing himself there speaks with so much vacillancy, pag. 176. *I dare not be too confident in so dark a point, but it seemeth to me that this justifying, transient act, is the enacting or promulgation of the new Covenant wherein justification is conferred upon every believer*; and in the close of all, when he hath spoke his full mind, he addes, pag. 180. *This is the present apprehension I have of the nature of remission, and justification*; adding, *Si quid novisti rectius, &c.* But now he peremptorily sayes, *I speak not of the effect of Gods Word as preached to mens heart, but as it is* (*lex promulgata, & fœdus, & testamentum*) *and so doth convey right, or constitute the dueness of the benefit*, 1 Joh. 5. 11, 12. I would learn of my Catechrist that is now thus raised out of douhtings, in this manner, to take the chair.

Mr. *Baxters* former vacillancy and hesitation in this doctrine.

1. Whether this enacting or promulgation of the new Covenant, (which is the transient act, in which justification is conferred on every believer) find men in the faith upon the promulgation of it? If so, then actual faith ptecedes any knowledge of the Covenant; if not, whether he presupposeth, that men upon the Lawes promulgation, will believe of themselves without any further work? or whether God makes use of any other instrument for the work of faith? If these be answered in the negative,

tive, that men will not believe of themselves upon such promulgation, nor there is any other like instrument for this work, then I think it must follow, that God makes use of this Covenant thus enacted to work men to believe, and so I am further confirmed in my former supposed mistake, that the Covenant works by a real operation on the soul in order to justification; Namely, By working men out of unbelief into faith. I had thought that when *Paul*, and *Appollos* are Ministers *by whom men believe*; that they had by the means of this enacted, or promulgated Covenant, brought men to this posture. And though justification be a relative change, and not a real, as is truly affirmed, yet that a real change had been wrought in the soul for this work. Whereas he saies, *He speaks not of the effect of Gods Word, as preached to mens hearts, but, &c.* I think he ought to speak so of it, when he speaks of it as an instrument of justification. In his sense, I suppose it can be no instrument of justification; an instrument must serve to work the thing of which it is an instrument: but in this case, justification is before-hand wrought; and therefore, according to the proverb, it cannot do that which is done before it comes: for the truth of this, let Mr. *Baxter* speak; *The accepting Christ in this Covenant, is true justifying faith, if an unregenerate man have this indeed, then he is justified*, pag. 66. A believing man hath this indeed, and so is indeed justified, and the grant of the Covenant, is an instrument for justification of a justified person; I am demanded, *Do you not often read in Divines of justificatio juris, vel legis, as distinct from justificatio judicis, vel per sententiam?* And I demand, whether of these justifications do procede? If *justificatio juris* go not before *justificatio judicis*, then the Judge justifies him whom the Law justifies not; In case it follow after, then it is onely a manifestation, or declaration of it, of which we may have further occasion to speak hereafter. And this considered, it appears to me that Mr. *Baxter* speaks of the Covenant onely as eyed of God, and not applyed to us, and then indeed it is no instrument of God, whereby he justifies, but his rule according to which he justifies. Pardon of sin is a relative change, yet Ministers appointed of Jesus Christ for the pardon of sin, are instrumental in working a real change from unbelief to faith in order to this work, and so are instruments of pardon *dispositivè*, as *Mason de Ministerio Anglicano* speaks, as well as *declarative*.

I added in my Treatise, [Forgiveneſſe of ſin is preached in the Goſpel, *Act.* 13. 38. but it is to thoſe that believe, that are juſtified; faith through the Spirit gives efficacy, and power of working to it:] And here comes in my ſecond charge mentioned. *I ſhould tremble* ſaith Mr. *Br. to ſay ſo, what Romaniſt by the doctrine of merit gives more to man in the work of juſtification!* I anſwer, *Paul* a *Romane* extols faith as high as I have done in Scripture already quoted in the work of juſtification, and, according to Mr. *Baxter*, farre more, ſeeing through the whole Chapter of *Heb.* 11. he ſpeaks as he ſayes, not onely of juſtifying faith, but as juſtifying, yet he is no *Romaniſt*. 2. Mr. *Br.* well knowes the *Romaniſts* diſtinction, of a firſt, and ſecond juſtification, which firſt juſtification Proteſtants onely allow, according to Scripture to be called juſtification; and that there is according to them, no ingrediency of any other grace but faith; and no merit in faith, but all of grace; for which he may ſee Mr. *Crandons* firſt parallell, Part 2. pag. 215. It followes, *If our faith give efficacy and power to the Goſpel to juſtifie us, then we juſtifie our ſelves, when the Goſpel juſtifies us, then the Goſpel is our inſtrument of juſtification; and can this be, unleſſe it be alſo ſaid, that we made the Goſpel? then God and we are concauſes in the Goſpels act of donation.* But how this can follow, I think few but himſelf can ſee: It will onely follow that the Goſpel cannot juſtifie us without us, that which *Auſtin* hath *de verbis Apoſtoli*, Ser. 15. will follow, *He that made thee without thee, doth not juſtifie thee without thee.* It will follow, that ſomewhat is to be done by us, without concurrence of which the Goſpel for juſtification is inefficacious; and how the ſecond can follow, that the Goſpel is our inſtrument of juſtification, I deſire to know: If *Naaman* dipping himſelf ſeven times in *Jordan*, rendred it by Divine appointment efficacious for cure of his Leproſie, will it follow, that *Jordan* was his inſtrument, whereby he cured himſelf? If the Angels moving on the water, *Joh.* 5. gave efficacy for cure to him that firſt entred, will it then follow, that it was either the Angels, or his inſtrument that firſt entred, and not rather the inſtrument of God onely? And to his queſtion moved, *Can this be, unleſſe we made the Goſpel?* If we ſhould grant that it is our inſtrument, will this follow? Can no man uſe an inſtrument unleſſe he firſt made it? *Peter* it ſeems was no *fiſher*, but rather

a

The Author acquit from complyance with *Romaniſts*.

Qui ergo fecit te ſine te, non juſtificat te ſine te.

a *Cutler*, and made the ſword wherewith he cut off *Malchus* ear, or elſe he could not have uſed it as his inſtrument. Neither followes it, that God and we are concauſes; It would onely follow, that there is a willing concurrence in us to accept of that which God of grace doth give. That of *Auſtin* will follow, which immediately is added in the place quoted, *He therefore that made thee unwilling, doth not juſtifie thee unwilling; yet he doth juſtifie thee, leſt it ſhould be thine own righteouſneſſe.* It will then follow, that in ſelf-denyal, renouncing all ſelf-righteouſneſſe, we humbly accept what God of grace doth give. After theſe ſuppoſed abſurdities, we have a liſt of ſubtle queſtions; *Is it the ſame power and efficacy for juſtification which the Goſpel receives from God, and which it receives from faith; or, are they divers? If divers ſhew us what they are, and which part of its efficacy and power the Goſpel receives from faith, and which from God. If they are the ſame, then God muſt convey juſtifying efficacy and power into faith firſt, and by faith into the Goſpel: which who imagineth? or why ſhould I be ſo vain as to ſtand to confute it?* That faith gives efficacy to the Goſpel for ſanctification Mr. *Baxter* will not deny, as appears in his words that follow, and his own expoſition of *Heb* 4. 2. 1 *Theſſ.* 2. 13. before mentioned, here let him then firſt anſwer his own queſtion reſpective to Sanctification, and by the help of him, and light borrowed from his illuminate notions, I ſhall aym ſomewhat at it, to anſwer his, reſpective to Juſtification: If it be the ſame power and efficacy for ſanctification that the Goſpel receives from God, and from faith, then God muſt convey efficacy and power into faith firſt, and by faith into the Goſpel for ſanctification; and till I have his anſwer, why ſhould I be ſo vain as to confute his? There followes, *Oh that you had condeſcended to your Readers weakneſſe, as to have deigned to ſhew him, Quomodo patitur Evangelium recipiendo? & Quid recipit, ut fiat potens & efficax? & Quomodo hæc potentia & efficacia fuit in fide? utrum eminenter, an formaliter? Aut utrum fides id communicavit, quod nunquam habuit? & quomodo agit fides in hoc influxu cauſativo in Evangelium?* For anſwer, I deſire Mr. *Baxter* to take into conſideration that Text of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 8. 3. *What the Law could not do, in that it was weakned through the fleſh*, &c. And whether he underſtand it reſpective to ſanctification, (which is not agreed upon among Interpreters) to give his Reader ſatisfaction, *Quomodo patitur Lex in*

Ergo fecit neſcientem, juſtificat volentem, tamen ipſe juſtificat, ne ſit juſtitia tua.

in hac debilitatione, &, Quid patitur, ut si at impotens et inefficax? &, Quomodo hac impotentia & inefficacia fuit in carne? utrum eminenter, an formaliter? & Quomodo agit Caro in hoc influxu debilitativo in legem? And I doubt not, but I may as easily answer his Queries, in order to the vindication of my assertion, as he may mine in vindication of that which the Apostle delivers. Answering the last, all is indeed answered. *Caro agit injiciendo obices, & remoras, Quo minus Lex operatur in corde hominis; Spiritus agit per fidem, ut causa removens impedimentum, E medio tollens obices, & remoras istas Incitando & potenter inclinando animam in amplexum promissionis divinæ.* I desire also his full Comment on the Apostles words, 2 *Cor.* 3. 6. *Who hath made us able Ministers of the New Testament, not of the Letter, but of the Spirit; for the Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life:* with a satisfying answer to all like Quæries that thence may be made. I suppose he will grant that they are able Ministers of the New Testament, no otherwise, then in preaching the Gospel; and when the bare Scripture (as *Tremelius* reads it) is of power onely to kill, we may demand how the Gospel suffers in receiving any such quickening power from the Spirit? And indeed the Gospel suffers not, but the soul in receiving power, to answer the Gospels call, whether to Justification, or sanctification: And that the Spirit makes use of faith in this quickening power, I think will not be denyed, seeing the Apostle tells us, *The life that I live in the flesh is by faith in the Son of God.* Faith therefore hath its hand in the Spirits quickening work: and he addes, *Sure you do not take the foregoing words for proof;* adding, *What though onely believers are justified by the Covenant, doth it follow, that faith gives efficacy and power to the Covenant to justifie? then either there are no conditions, or causa sine quibus non, or else they are all efficients, and give efficacy and power to other efficients:* I confesse those words taken by themselves, in that sense, as he may fancy, and the words in themselves may bear, will not come up to a full proof; Justification may be restrained onely to believers, and yet faith have no hand in it; but seeing other Scriptures give an efficiency to faith in this work, some of them speaking of it, as Gods instrument, *Rom.* 3. 30. most of them as mans, we may well then know, that Scripture holds it not out as any such naked condition; To others the Gospel-grant lyes dead, to these through faith it is effectuall; There is added,

Your

Your terms of [*faiths giving power through the Spirit*] *tell me, that sure you still look at the wrong act of the Gospel; not at its moral act of conveyance, or donation, but at its reall operation on mans heart.* I do look at the act of the Gospel, as its real operation on mans heart, and yet I look at the right act of it; The Gospel is an instrument to justifie by the intervening act of faith, according to Protestants, and by the intervening work of sanctification according to Papists, and according to both there is a real work on the soul necessary to put into a posture for Justification. All know that Divines distinguish between redemption wrought by Christ, and the application of it. Redemption is the proper work of the Son, but Application they ascribe to the Spirit; [a] *The Father and the Son are said* (saith *Amesius*) *to send the Spirit, to perfect this application*, Medull. Theol. Cap. 24. Sect. 5. And whereas I am told that *neither Scripture, nor Divines use to say that the Gospel remitteth sin, or justifieth by the Spirit; nor doth the Spirit otherwise do it then by inditing the Gospel*, &c. Though I own not this phrase that is here put upon me, and I might expect so much priviledge, as to be Master of my own words; yet I would have it taken into further consideration, whether Divines use his language or mine, or whether they judge not that to [illegible] the right act of the Gospel for pardon of sin, which I mention. The *Leyden* Divines having spoke of the application of the righteousnesse of Christ, Disp. 33. Sect. 21. have these words, Sect 24. [b] *This application in us is made by the holy Spirit*, 1 Cor. 6. 11. *viz. by the gift of faith; For he works it by the Ministery of the Gospel* (*which is called the Ministery of the Spirit*, 2 Cor. 3. 8.) *and encreases it by his Word and Sacraments*, Phil. 1. 29. Gal. 5 5. *From whence it is called the Spirit of faith*, 2 Cor. 4. 13. *whereby we apprehend God as gracious, Christ as Redeemer, and his righteousnesse, and from it everlasting life*, Joh 1. 12. *Rom.* 9. 30. And Sect. 25 *This application on our part is made by faith*, Rom. 5. 1. Acts 26. 18. *By faith, and through faith*, Rom. 3. 30. *We are justified, and God justifies us*: with much more to that purpose. And *Ravanellus*

[a] Hinc Pater & Filius mittere dicuntur Spiritum ad applicationem istam perficiendam.

[b] Hæc applicatio in nobis & fit à Spiritu sancto, 1 Cor. 6. 11. dono scilicet fidei. Ipse enim eam per Ministerium Evangelii (Quod Ministerium Spiritûs dicitur, 2 Cor. 3. 8,) ingenerat, ac verbo suo ac Sacramentis confirmat & auget, Phil. 1. 29. Gal. 5. 5. Unde & Spiritus fidei dicitur, 2 Cor. 4. 13. quâ Deum ut gratiosum, Christum ut redemptorem, ejusq; justitiam, & ex eâ vitam æternam apprehendimus, Joan. 1. 12. Rom. 9. 30.

A parte nostrâ, fide, Rom. 5. 2. Actor. 26. 18. & ex fide, & per fidem, Ro. 3. 30. Justificamur & justificat nos Deus.

in verbum justificatio, speaking of the instrument of justification faith, it is either *outward* or *inward* [c] The *outward instrumental cause*, he saith, *is the Word of God and the Sacraments, as appears from*, Rom. 4. 11. [*where circumcision is called the seal of the righteousnesse of faith*] *for*, saith he, *the Word of God, and Sacraments, are instruments by which God doth call, and by which he works, preserves, and encreases faith in us, and seals in our heart the grace of justification, and so also the Ministers of the Church, and others, which teach us the way of salvation*, Dan. 12. 3. *Gomarus*, Matth 5. 4. pag. 46. denying any affections or work of man preceding faith, to be the procuring cause of justification, and affirming that faith it self is no such cause, but an instrument onely; gives this reason, [e] *That honour belongs onely to the grace of God, and merit of Christ, and efficacy of the holy Ghost*; so far are these Divines from excluding the Spirit from having any hand in this work: such a Gospel instrumentality as that it should do nothing at all on the souls of men, I have not before read or heard of. As it tenders conditions, so it is employed to work the conditions that it tenders: It makes known the mind of God, that men believing have right to Christ, and in him to justification, and it works faith for justification, onely believers saved by it, and it is the power of God, and not *nudè signum voluntatis divinæ*, to salvation. And as the Simile brought by Mr. *Baxter* of a *Fathers bequeathing by his testament an hundred pound a peece to each of his sons*; *To one on condition he will aske it of his elder Brother, and thanke him for it; to a second, and third upon conditions at pleasure*, with this demand upon it, *Do any of these conditions give power to the testament? No, yet the testament doth not efficaciter agere, till they are performed, why is that?* (saith he) *because all such instruments work morally; onely by expressing ut signa the will of the agent; and therefore they work both when and how he will, and it is his will that they shall not work till such a time, and but upon such termes, &c.* He might easily see how little this

c Causa instrumentalis externa verbum Dei & Sacramenta ut patet ex Rom. 4. 11. [ubi circumcisio appellatur sigillum justitiæ fidei] nam verbum Dei & Sacramenta sunt organa, per quæ Deus nos vocat, & per quæ operatur, conservat, ac auget in nobis fidem, obsignatq; in cordibus nostris gratiam justificationis; atque adeo Ministri Ecclesiæ & alii qui docent nos viam salutis, Dan. 12. 3.

e Nullæ hominum affectiones, ac præparationes, nullaq; opera fidem antecedentia, justificationis causæ, nedum procreantes esse possunt; imo nec fides ipsa causa illius est procreans (cum ea laus soli gratiæ Dei, ac merito Christi & efficaciæ Spiritus sancti competat, Rom. 3. 24. & 28. Ephes. 2 8.) sed tantum instrumentalis.

this ſerves to our preſent purpoſe. 1. That which he ſpeaks of, is a bare teſtament, and no more; but the Goſpel (as elſewhere I have ſhewed) is a Covenant truly ſo called, and not barely a teſtament. 2. Thoſe Legacies are ſuch gifts that each ſon would be apt to imbrace, being ready to put a ſufficiently high eſtimate upon them; But this Goſpel-gift, if nothing further be done, will for ever lye contemned, and neglected. 3. The will is a meer inſtrument of donation, leaving the Legatee to himſelf; to accept or refuſe. The Goſpel is the inſtrument of Gods power by the Spirit, to change the heart, and work upon the will for acceptance. 4. Theſe teſtament-legacies preſuppoſe the condition not yet performed, and ſo the Legatee without all right upon Teſtament-termes; But Mr. *Baxters* Goſpel-donation, ſuppoſes the conditions already done, and the ſoul upon that account in full poſſeſſion, before this Goſpel-donation comes; It conveyes right to a believer, and if he be a believer, as hath been abundantly ſhewed, he is in preſent poſſeſt of Chriſt his righteouſneſſe, and juſtification by him. And whether or no, I have acquit my ſelf from the double charge, brought againſt me, I ſhall leave to the Readers conſideration.

1. If there be an inſtrumental efficiency aſcribed to faith in Scripture in a work, in which there is as much of God, and as little of man ſeen as in the work of juſtification, then there is no reaſon but that faith alſo hath an inſtrumental efficacy in the work of juſtification. This is clear; The reaſon given why faith ſhould have no inſtrumental efficacy, is, becauſe this takes from God, who alone is the efficient, and aſcribes to man, who is juſtified, and doth not juſtifie himſelf: But an inſtrumental efficiency is aſcribed in Scripture to faith, in a work on which there is as much of God, and as little of man, as in the work of juſtification. This is clear, in miraculous cures wrought upon diſeaſed perſons: The work upon them was Gods, not mans; They were cured, and did not cure themſelves, yet an inſtrumental efficiency is aſcribed to their faith. If thoſe words ſpoke to the two blind men, *Matth.*9.29. *According to your faith, be it unto you*, nor that of *Paul*, concerning the creeple at *Lyſtra*, *That he had faith to be healed*, Act.14.9. nor yet that of Chriſt to the *Canaanitiſh* woman, *Matth.*15.28. *O woman, great is thy faith, be it unto thee as thou wilt*, will not hold it out, which yet ſeem to ſpeak very much this way; (other graces were qualifications, yet none but

but this is taken notice of) yet that to the woman with the bloody iſſue is full, *Matth.*9.22. *Mark.*5.34. *Thy faith hath made thee whole*, not onely made whole by faith (which is an exception againſt faiths juſtifying) but faith made her whole, words ſpeaking as much of inſtrumental efficacy as may be. The concluſion then followes, That faith hath its inſtrumental efficiency in juſtification likewiſe. *Pareus* his notes upon the words are worthy obſervation. *As Chriſt aſcribes it to faith, that the woman is healed of the diſeaſe of her body: ſo it is certain, that by faith we obtain remiſſion of ſins, and adoption of children of God according to the doctrine of the Goſpel.*

Quemadmodum fidei aſcribit Chriſtus quod mulier ſoluta eſt à morbo corporis, ita certum eſt fide nos conſequi remiſſionem peccatorum & adoptionem filiorum Dei juxta doctrinam Evangelii.

2. If there be an inſtrumental efficiency aſcribed to faith in Scripture reſpective to ſalvation: then there is an inſtrumental efficacy aſcribed to faith, reſpective to juſtification. This is plain; nothing can inſtrumentally work to ſalvation, that takes not in juſtification: But an inſtrumental efficacy is aſcribed to faith, reſpective to ſalvation, *Luk.*7.59. *He ſaid to the woman, Thy faith hath ſaved thee.* In the context there is a full proof of the *Major*. The great priviledge which ſhe of grace received there is the forgiveneſſe of her many ſins, and this is acribed to her faith. The *Minor* is fully proved: Her great love is mentioned as a conſequent of this grace received; But it is aſcribed to her faith, as that which had its alone efficacy, *Thy faith hath ſaved thee.* As we are ſaved by faith, or through faith, *Epheſ.*2. 8. ſo faith ſaves. The concluſion then followes, that faith hath its inſtrumental efficacy in juſtification.

3. That which puts a man into poſſeſſion of that from which juſtification neceſſarily and inevitably followes, that is either a principal efficient, or an inſtrument in juſtification. This cannot be denyed: He that puts me into a place, to which a plentiful livelihood is neceſſarily annexed, is either the efficient or an inſtrument of my livelihood: But faith puts into poſſeſſion of Chriſt, from whom juſtification neceſſarily followes. This propoſition conſiſts of two parts. 1. That faith puts into poſſeſſion of Chriſt. 2. That juſtification neceſſarily followes this poſſeſſion. But I ſhall ſtand upon the proof of neither, ſeeing as in themſelves they are plain, ſo they are confeſſed by Mr. *Baxter*. Faith then is either the efficient or inſtrument in our juſtification. Not the efficient, all know, and therefore an inſtrument.

4. That

4. That which is aſcribed in Scripture both to God and man, in a work, in which there is a concurrence of God and man, in ſuch expreſſions, which uſually hold forth the efficiency of an inſtrument, and cannot fairly be interpreted otherwiſe, is not unfitly called an inſtrument both of God and man in ſuch a work. This I know not how fairly can be denyed; and any man will but abuſe his reaſon that calls for a proof of it: But faith in Scripture is aſcribed both to God and man in the work of juſtification, in which there is a mutual concurrence of God and man, and in words that uſually hold out the working of an inſtrument, and cannot fairly be interpreted otherwiſe: Therefore faith is not unfitly called the inſtrument of God, and man in juſtification. The Minor conſiſts of four parts. 1. That faith in juſtification is aſcribed both to God and man, and this conſiſts alſo of two parts. 1. That faith is aſcribed to God in juſtification; and this we have already proved from, *Rom.* 3.30. *Gal.* 3. 8. as it is alſo aſcribed to him in ſanctification, *Act.* 17. 9. 2. That it is aſcribed to man in juſtification which is held out to us whereſoever we are ſaid to be juſtified by faith, ſeeing faith is the act of man: and the Prophet tells us, *The juſt ſhall live by his faith*, which the Apoſtle applyes to juſtification, *Rom.* 1.17. *Gal.* 3.11. The ſecond part in this Propoſition is, That there is a mutual concurrence of God and man in this work, as God gives a diſcharge, ſo man accepts: Which by Mr. *Br.* himſelf is acknowledged, according to that before quoted out of *Auſtin.* The third part is, That this is aſcribed to God and man in expreſſions that uſually hold forth the efficiency of an inſtrument, which the phraſes [by] and [through] do manifeſt. The fourth is, That it cannot be fairly interpreted otherwiſe, or of any other thing but an inſtrument. And this is alſo clear, Either it muſt hold out a meritorious cauſe, a meer condition, or elſe an inſtrument. A meritorious cauſe none will ſay, a meer condition, or bare *cauſa ſine quâ non*, it cannot be, for two reaſons. 1. Such phraſes are uncouth, to ſay, That a thing is done by that which is meerly a condition *ſine quâ non* of it. 2. There are many other ſuch conditions, to which this is never thus applyed, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *To which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he ſhall be to me a Sonne?* Heb. 1.5. *To which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, Sit on my right hand, untill*

I make thine enemies thy footstoole? Heb. 1.13. so we may say, To which of the graces, (when all are reckoned up by number) was it ever said, that we are justified by it? The conclusion then followes as before, that faith is an instrument of God and man in justification.

5. Out of this we may more briefly thus argue: If the holy Ghost single out faith from among all other graces; which are yet conditions or *causæ sine quibus non*, and ascribes alone to it that which in the ordinary acceptation holds out an instrumental efficiency, then it is not a bare condition, or *causa sine quâ non*, but an instrumental efficient: But the holy Ghost singles out faith from among all other graces which are conditions and *causæ sine quibus non*, and ascribes to it and no other, that which in the ordinary acceptation implies an instrumental efficiency; The conclusion then followes, that faith is an instrumental efficient in justification.

Lastly, To bring if it may be a compromizing argument, If faith works at least, that which is proportionable to an instrument properly and rigidly so called in the work of justification, then it is not unfitly called by the name of an instrument. This is plain; that which does work, that every way answers to the work of an instrument, that may fitly be called by that name; But faith works at least, that which is proportionable to the work of an instrument. This is confest by Mr. *Br.* who is ready to yield that it should be called, *Instrumentum Metaphoricum*, and a Metaphor is a figure whereby a word is carried out of its most proper signification, unto an other that carries resemblance and proportion with it. In case then it does not that which is proportionable to an instrument properly so called, it is no *instrumentum Metaphporicum, but Catachresticon.* And indeed Mr. *Baxters* glosse renders it such a *Catachresis*, as may make all Rhetorique ashamed of it. A Metaphoricall Instrument that shall have no resemblance of an instrument in it; But if any will say that an instrument is externall, sensible, whether it be for operation or reception; but faith is internall, invisible; and therefore no instrument rigidly and properly so called, though there be no cogent reason to yield it, (for as is the agent, so well may be the instrument), yet I shall not be so stiff to contend about it; yield that it doth the work to put into Christ from whom Justification necessarily followes, and I will no longer contend

tend about the Word, but let it be an inſtrument in exact property of ſpeech or in a Metaphor as men ſhall pleaſe.

As to that of the ſole ſufficiency of the Word, without faith, as an inſtrument in Juſtification; I might take up an argument from Mr. *Baxters*, and thus reaſon: That which cannot bring a man to the works that are antecedent to juſtification, cannot juſtify: This is clear; That which cannot work the prerequiſites, cannot work the thing it ſelf: But the Word alone (according to Mr. *Baxter*) cannot bring a man to theſe antecedent works, Sect. 14. Chap. 29. *Ergo.* But I ſhall content my ſelf at preſent with this onely. That which the Word ſaies, is done by faith, it cannot do without it; This is clear: But the Word ſaies, and frequently ſaies, we are juſtified by faith: *Ergo* the Word cannot juſtify without faith. Here ſome diſtinction muſt be uſed, if any evaſion be endeavored; But then it muſt be confeſſed, that it is an other kind of juſtification that is ſpoke to by Mr. *Baxter* then is laid down in Scripture: For Scripture-juſtification is ſtill by faith: that is the Holy Ghoſts conſtant language. And to come to a right underſtanding (if it may be) of parties; ſomewhat muſt be yielded, and ſomewhat aſſerted, and maintained. That which muſt be yielded is, That God in his Word declares upon what terms a man may attain unto juſtification; and to this the Word, as *ſignum voluntatis divinæ* (being a manifeſtation of Gods pleaſure concerning the juſtification of a ſinner) is ſufficient; So farre I ſhall willingly grant. That which is to be aſſerted is, 1. That this manifeſtation of Gods pleaſure, or *ſignum voluntatis divinæ* before mentioned, is the firſt ground work on which the whole work of juſtification is bottomed, and goes before thoſe graces but now mentioned, which Mr. *Baxter* makes antecedent to juſtification. This is plain. The termes on which God will juſtifie muſt be underſtood, before men can be brought to accept and come up to them. 2. This manifeſtation of Gods will thus made knowne, and by the power of the Spirit applyed to the ſoul, in an unjuſtified condition, works to humiliation, regeneration, faith, and by faith to juſtification. 3. This manifeſtation of Gods pleaſure being applyed to a man already humbled, regenerate and in faith, finds him as we have heard before in a juſtified poſture. Though Faith in nature goes before juſtification, as the cauſe before the effect; yet they are in that manner *ſimul tempore*; that none can conceive a believing man in an

unjustified condition: that so there should any intervall or time passe, for conveyance of right by Gospel-grant to justification. 4. This Gospel-grant or manifestation of Gods mind being thus tendred as before,; to a regenerate believing soul, serves for ratification and confirmation of his justified condition, to make good to such a believing son or daughter, that their sinnes are forgiven. To apply these assertions to our present purpose. This manifestation of Gods pleasure, Gospel-grant, or *signum voluntatis divinæ*, or whatsoever else we call it, in the first consideration justifies not; Going before that which is antecedent to Justification (as we see it does) it cannot justify. In the second consideration it works indeed to justification; But if we yield this to Mr. *Baxter*, he will not accept of it; for he saies, he does not thus speak of it; and in this consideration it justifies not without faith, but works faith in order to Justification. *By this man is preached forgivenesse of sins, and by him all that believe are justified.* In the third consideration it justifies not, seeing it finds the work done to its hands, and onely serves for the work of assurance as in the last place is asserted. So that, all that can be said of this Gospel-grant, donation, or conveyance of right (so often by Mr. *Baxter* mentioned in this work) is, 1. To make known Gods mind, on what termes justification may be attained. 2 By the power of the Spirit through faith to work it, and finally to assure, ratify, and confirm it. I shall the refore close this dispute (if I may be allowed so to stile it) in the words of *Chemnitius* in his Common place, de justificat, *mihi* pag. 797. octavo. Having spoken to the causes of justification he saith, *It is altogether necessary that there be application made of these causes to the person to be justified. For as many as received him, to them he gave power to be made the Sons of God*, John. 1. 12. *and*, 3. v. 33. *And this manner or medium of application or apprehension, speaking to mens capacity, is called a cause instrumental. And this instrumentall cause is twofold.* 1. *Teaching, Opening, Offering, and Exibiting the benefits of justification, by which God doth communicate unto us those gifts; And this is the Word of the Gospel, and use of Sacraments, or as the Ancients speak, the Word vocal and visible.*

Omnino verò necesse est fieri applicatione m harum causarum ad personam justificandam. Nam quotquot receperunt eum, his fecit potestatem filios Dei fieri, Joan. 1, 12. & 3. 33. Et Modus seu medium applicationis seu apprehensionis docendi gratiâ vocatur causa instrumentalis. Duplex autem est causa instrumentalis. 1. Docens, Patefaciens, Offerens et Exhibens beneficia justificationis per quam Deus nobis communicat illa bona et hæc est vox Evangelii et usus sactamentorum, vel sicut veteres loquuntur, verbum vocale et visibile.

2. *Receiving*

2. *Receiving or apprehending, whereby we apply those gifts to our selves, which are offered in the Gospel, that we may be made partakers of them. There is therefore the hand of God, as it were delivering; and the hand of man receiving that which is delivered. And testimonies are both observed, and above explained, that onely faith (and no other qualities or works in us) is the medium of application.*

2. Recipiens seu apprehendens, quâ nobis applicamus illa bona quæ in Evangelio offeruntur, ita ut eorum participes reddamur. Est igitur quasi manus Dei tradens, et hominis manus suscipiens id quod traditur. Supra autem testimonia et annotata et explicata sunt solam fidem, non ullas alias vel qualitates, vel opera in nobis esse medium applicationis.

SECT. VI.

A fourth Corollary from the former Doctrine.

Christians must get assurance that they do act according to these principles.

AS Christians must see that they be aright principled in this Gospel-doctrine of the righteousnesse of faith, so also they must get assurance that they act according to these principles, which I might urge respective to all that, which is required of a man of Gospel-righteousnesse. But having already spoke to that purpose in pressing the necessity of the answer of conscience unto Sacramental engagements; I shall here onely urge it, respectively to that grace which immediately interests us in this righteousnesse, which is the grace of faith, as we see in the Text; which is confest to be the grace that receives Christ, even by those that deny the instrumentality of it in our Justification. If this righteousnesse which is our Justification be the righteousnesse of Faith, then those that are void of faith must needs be wanting in this righteousnesse, and Christ being the end of the Law for righteousnesse to those that believe, those that persist in unbelief never attain to this end. And howsoever zealous they may otherwise appear, yet they come short of righteousnesse for life and salvation. Giving assent to all Gospel-truths, (perhaps upon the principles of their education) they may not onely have the repute, but also enjoy all outward priviledges of believers; yet wanting that work upon their will, or if you please in their affections to receive Christ and close with him, they yet have not

Eſpecially to ſee to their faith.

Chriſt nor life in him, and therefore upon this account, there is all reaſon to hearken to that of the Apoſtle, 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *Examine your ſelves, whether ye be in the faith: prove your own ſelves: Know ye not your own ſelves, how that Jeſus Chriſt is in you, except ye be Reprobates?* In which words we ſee the Apoſtles exhortation, and his reaſon annext. The exhortation calls us to ſelf-examination, to a ſelf-tryal, an inquiſitive, experimental tryal; The queſtion to be put, or thing to be proved, or brought to upon tryal, is our *faith*, not barely the doctrine of faith (as ſome would have it) whereby we may conclude that we are of ſuch a Church, in which Chriſt is viſibly reſident in Ordinances, but the grace of faith, whereby he makes his abode in our ſoules. The reaſon annexed is put by way of interrogation, or queſtion, *Know ye not your own ſelves, how that Jeſus Chriſt is in you, except ye be reprobates?* which doth not imply, that all are Reprobates, that know not in preſent, that Chriſt is in them; but this is all that is implyed or can be gathered, that Jeſus Chriſt is in all that are not reprobates; where reprobate is not yet oppoſed to the Elect, as though all ſuch were everlaſtingly caſt-awayes in whom Chriſt is not in preſent: But as the word is uſed, *Jer.* 6. 30. reprobate ſilver, that is, unfit for uſe or ſervice, ſo it is here taken: ſuch in preſent are not in a ſaving, but in a loſt condition; and therefore it much concerns us to put this upon the tryal.

Motives to perſwade to get aſſurance of this grace. 1. Neceſſity of Faith.

For Motives to put men upon this work, conſider,

Firſt, the neceſſity of this grace, and that upon a ſeveral account; 1. Without Faith (as you have heard) we are without this righteouſneſſe. None in unbelief can ſay of Chriſt, *Jehovah our righteouſneſſe.* All the good that Chriſt does, unbelief loſes; ſo much good that Chriſt can do thee, of ſo much unbelief ſtrips thee. The Apoſtle tells us of unſearchable riches in Chriſt, *Epheſ.* 3. 8. Such that none can ſumme up, nor he that is higheſt in skill in Arithmetique calculate. Chriſt is the Fathers Store-houſe, Magazine, or rich Exchequer; The Father hath not a gift for any of his, but he layes it up in Chriſt, and a faith receives it from Chriſt. *Noah* by faith was *heir of this righteouſneſſe*, Heb. 11. 7. The reſt of the world wanting this grace went without this inheritance. The reſt of *Canaan* was loſt by unbelief, Heb. 3. 18. The reſt of heaven will be thus loſt in like manner; *God hath choſen the poor of this world, rich in faith,*

faith, heires of the Kingdome, which he hath prepared for thoſe that love him, Jam. 2. 5. The rich of this world deſtitute of this Faith, make forfeiture of this Kingdome. Is Chriſt a gift? Faith receives him, and unbelief is wanting. Is Chriſt food? Faith feeds upon him, and unbelief is hunger-ſtarved. Is Chriſt rayment? Faith puts him on, and unbelief is naked. Is Chriſt a Medicine? Faith applyes him, and unbelief languiſheth. Is Chriſt a laver? Faith drencheth and douzeth it ſelf in him, and unbelief is filthy, and defiled. Is Chriſt a pardon? Faith ſues it out, and unbelief lyeth under guilt. Is Chriſt ſatisfaction? Faith makes the plea, and attains a diſcharge, and unbelief remains indebted. 2. Without Faith, the ſoul is under the wrath of God and his ireful diſpleaſure. This is a neceſſary reſult from the former. The man of unbelief wants that which might be interpoſed as an atonement, and might ſtand as a skreen or ſhield for his guard. And it is alſo fully laid down in Chriſt's words, *Joh.* 3. 36. *He that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.* What *Zophar* ſaith of the wicked man, *Job* 20. 29. *This is his portion from God, and the heritage appointed him of God*, that Chriſt ſayes of unbelievers: ſo long as they remain in unbelief, ſo long wrath abides on them. All by nature are the children of wrath, having no other inheritance; and the man of unbelief never gets from under wrath to attain any other portion. This is an aggregate of all miſeries, when all is reckoned up that can be named, to make miſerable, wrath comprizeth it all to the uttermoſt, to infiniteneſſe. *As is the man, ſo is his ſtrength*, ſay *Zeba*, and *Zalmunna*, Judg. 8. 21. As is God, ſo is his wrath; with this motive the Pſalmiſt preſſeth to faith, *Pſal.* 2. 12. Thy ſin hath merit enough to damne, and thou haſt not any intereſt in Chriſt to ſave or deliver. He that is void of Faith, and yet under no ſuch feares, it is not becauſe there is no cauſe of feares, but that ſuch a ſoul is not awakened, to ſee his fearful deplored and deſperate condition. If the rich glutton had ſeen Hell gaping for him, and the Devil ready to hale and drag him, he could not then have had any liſt to his every-dayes Gorgeous apparrel, nor yet any appetite to his delicate fare. That is the condition of ſecure ſenſual ones, till Hell-fire flame about them, they think they are ſure of heaven. 3. Without faith there is no benefit to be had, or good to be found in any Ordinances. No Ordinance is uſeful but either as it

it is improved by Faith already ſeated in the ſoul, or as it is ſerviceable to the plantation of it. No duty of any kind works to acceptance from an unbelievers hand. *Abel's* ſacrifice was accepted, when *Cain's* could not gain acceptance, *Gen.* 4. 4, 5. The Apoſtle ſhews us the reaſon of this difference, *Heb.* 11. 4. *By faith Abel offered a more excellent ſacrifice then Cain.* The Parable of the ſower tells us, how few profitable hearers of the Word there can be found; and the Apoſtle gives the reaſon, *Heb.* 4. 2. *The Word is not mixt with faith in thoſe that hear it.* It is effectual alone in believers, 1 *Theſſ.* 2. 13. and no more have audience in prayer, then thoſe that profit in hearing: and there is one and the ſame reaſon of both, *Jam.* 1. 6, 7. And that man is doubtleſſe under an heavy Judgment, that never gets good when he hears from God, nor obtains his requeſt when he ſeeks to God. At the Lords Table they eat bread, but feed not on Chriſt; they take the Cup, but have no intereſt in the blood of the new Covenant. 4. Without faith nothing is done that God accepts. The man and the work both diſpleaſe, *Heb.* 11. 6. There muſt be a concurrence of all requiſites to render a work good, and acceptable: But in an unbelievers work (the matter of the work excepted) all requiſites are wanting. The riſe is from a fountain that is unclean, and the unbelieving ſoul cannot go ſo high as to make the glory of God the end. And the rule is above him in the work to look after. 5. Without Faith the whole of man, head, breaſt, and bowels, are all open to Satan. Faith is a Chriſtians ſhield, *Epheſ.* 6. 16. and a ſhield is the defence not of one part, but the guard of the whole. A man without faith, is a Souldier without armes, and deſtitute of all power to make any manner of reſiſtance. Satan leads ſuch an one at pleaſure. There is nothing of Chriſt, nothing of grace, nothing of the Spirit, to ſtand up in oppoſition. Some devils are not reſiſted without ſtrength of faith, *Mark* 9. 29. No devil without faith can be vanquiſhed or overcome.

Mot. 2. The benefits that faith brings: as, 1. Whole of Chriſt theirs.

Secondly, Conſider the benefits of faith, the glory that doth accompany it. 1. Chriſt is his, and all that is Chriſts, who doth believe. Chriſt with all his unſearchable riches is made over to believers; This is the greateſt of gifts that God hath in his hand for to beſtow; and imparting this gift, with it he gives all things. Theſe are ſons of God, *Joh.* 1. 12. and being ſons, they are heires, joint-heirs with Chriſt, *Rom.* 8. 17. heirs of the

the righteouſneſſe of faith, *Heb.* 11. 7. heirs of a Kingdome, *Jam.* 2. 5. Heaven and all on this ſide heaven, that ſtands in any reference to it, is theirs, *Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things preſent, or things to come: all are theirs, and they are Chriſts, and Chriſt is Gods*, 1 Cor. 3. 22. 2. Theſe ſtand ſecure againſt every enemy. Firſt, they are ſecure againſt Satan mans capital and moſt potent adverſary. They ſtand ſecure againſt his accuſations, having an advocate in heaven that makes appearance to anſwer every charge againſt them. It is of the beleiving elect (not onely choſen from eternity, but in time taken out from the reſt of the world) that the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *Rom.* 8. 33. *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect?* Chriſts death, reſurrection, and interceſſion in glory is his anſwer to every plea. All that the unbeliever wants, in thoſe ſeveral relations that we ſpoke to in Chriſt, that the man of faith enjoyes, nothing can be conceived in ſin, but there is in Chriſt to anſwer. Secondly, The believer ſtands ſecure againſt Satans temptations: upon reſiſtance Satan flees, *Jam.* 4. 7. and they make ſtrong reſiſtance, 1 *Pet.* 5. 9. Theſe are ſecure againſt the world: *Whatſoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victtory that overcometh the world, even our faith*, 1 John 5. 4. *Greater is he that is in them, then he that is in the world. They are kept by the power of God, through faith unto ſalvation*, 1 Pet. 1. 5. The everlaſting arms are underneath them. Faith intereſts it ſelf in God, and all that is of God, for ſafety and preſervation; The office or work which is aſcribed to God reſpective to mans preſervation, is aſcribed to faith; The Lord is a ſhield or Buckler for defence, *Pſal.* 18. 2. *The Lord is my rock, my fortreſſe, my deliverer, my Buckler*, Prov. 2. 7. *He is a Buckler to them that walk uprightly*, Pſalme 3. 3. *Thou Lord art a ſhield for me*; with endleſſe more places; Yea, God is ſo a ſhield that there is no other, *Pſalme* 47. 9. *The ſhields of the earth belong unto God*: yet faith is a ſhield, *Epheſians* 6. 16. What God can do for ſafety, faith can do: not by any ſtrength of its own, ſo faith were advanced into the place of God, but onely as intereſting us in God, and in all which is of God. Faith intereſts it ſelf in the power of God, and takes in omnipotence for help, ſo did *Abraham* by faith, *Rom.* 4. 21. No difficulty in the thing could cauſe his faith to ſtagger. So did *Jehoſhaphat*, in that danger in which he ſtood, 2 *Chron.* 20. 6. ſo *Aſa*, 2 *Chron.* 14. 11. ſo the three

2. They ſtand ſeeure againſt every enemy.

1. Againſt Satan. In his accuſatious.

In his temptations.

2. Againſt the world.

3. It intereſts in God and all that is Gods. His power.

three children when they were in danger of the fiery furnace, *Dan.* 3.17. Faith intereſts it ſelf in the faithfulneſſe of God, and realizeth every promiſe to the ſoul: and therefore it is ſaid by the Apoſtle to be *the evidence of things not ſeen*, Heb. 11.1. what no eye can ſee any other way then in a promiſe, that faith looks upon as preſent; ſo *Sarah* in the promiſe which ſhe received, *Heb.* 11. 11. ſo *David*, 2 *Sam* 7.. 28. So that he praies, *In thy faithfulneſſe hear me, and in thy righteouſneſſe*, Pſal. 143. 1. Gods truth is the believers Shield and Buckler, *Pſal.* 92. 4. Faith intereſts it ſelf in the mercies of God, in the multitude of his bowels and compaſſions; ſo the Pſalmiſt in thoſe depths, in which he was plunged, *Pſal.* 130. 1. 33. 4. and under that guilt that he had drawn upon his ſoul, *Pſal.* 51. 1. and ſo the Church in that low condition into which ſhe was caſt, *Lament.* 3. 22. Faith intereſts it ſelf in the Wiſdom of God, when all light is ſo clouded and all channels ſo ſtopt, that no viſible means on earth can be found, faith knowes that what we ſee not, God ſees. As Chriſt could convey himſelf out of the midſt of his enemies, ſo he can free his from their enemies; As he could enter when the doores were ſhut, ſo he knowes how to open all obſtructions. So *Jehoſhaphats* faith was acted, *We know not what to do, but our eyes are upon thee*, 2. Chr. 20. 12. So *Mordecai's* faith likewiſe, *Eſth.* 4. 14. Enlargement and deliverance ſhall ariſe to the *Jewes* from another place; So *Peter*, *The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations*, 2. Pet. 2. 9. Faith intereſts it ſelf in the help of the Angels of God; when the Prophets ſervants eyes were opened, he ſaw Mountains, full of horſes and Chariots, 2. *King.* 6. 17. a whol hoſt of Angels for defence in ſtraits; and thoſe *Jacob* ſaw when his Brother *Eſau* marched againſt him, *Gen.* 32. 1, 2. The believing man knowes what the *Pſalmiſt* ſayes, Pſal. 34. 7. *The Angell of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them.* This promiſe is made to every confiding ſoul, Pſal. 91. 11, 12. *He ſhall give his Angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy waies; They ſhall bear thee up in their hands leſt thou daſh thy foot againſt a ſtone.*

His faithfulneſſe.

His mercy.

His wiſdome.

His Angels.

Mot. 3. This aſſurance is poſſible.

3. This work though difficult, and not eaſie to paſſe through, yet is feaſible and poſſible; difficult it is, or elſe ſuch a narrow ſearch and diligent ſcrutiny needed not; and poſſible it is, otherwiſe it booted not. Copper may be like unto Gold, and tinne unto Silver; yet that gold or ſilver which is right, may be known from

from all that is counterfeit. The good ground well look'd into may be differenced from the best of those grounds which are bad. A temporary faith may be like that which is true, yet it is not the same with it, and may be distinguished from it. There is somewhat in the faith of the elect, that is not to be found in the faith of any other in the world. Otherwise hypocrites must everlastingly feed themselves with vain hopes, and the true believer lye under unnecessary fears: so no Minister of Christ could be able to divide the Word aright to any of his people. The hypocrite would apply the believers comforts, and the believer would lye under the hypocrites terrors.

Mot. 4. Upon tryal faith may be found approved.

Fourthly, Upon tryal thy faith may be found temptation-proof. It may appear upon search to be such as it ought. There is many times most hopes of those that are aptest to call it into question. As there are many who scarce ever questioned, but that they do believe, yet when they come to the test, are nothing, TEKEL may be written upon them, *Thou art weighed in the balance, and art found wanting*, Dan. 5. 27. What the Wiseman saith of riches is true being applyed to faith *Prov.* 13. 7. Some boast themselves of the strength of their faith, that they thank God they have ever believed, when as their faith is a meer fancy. These boasters are but a crack, like a banquerupts vapour. Others complain of their unbelief, yet ready to renounce all for Christ, their complaint is not out of want of faith no more then the covetous worldlings is out of want of wealth, but because they cannot give themselves satisfaction in believing.

Mot. 5. Howsoever the case is not forlorn and remediesse.

Fifthly, In case upon a due search and tryal thou find but a shadow of faith, and no substance; a meer resemblance of justifying faith, and not the faith that doth justifie, yet it is not so remediesselely gone, but that it may be holpen; not so deplored, but that a cure may be had. The most barren ground may be made fruit full, and the heart that is most obdurate may be made fleshy. God out of the number of unbelieving ones, and out of the number of meer pretenders to the faith, chooseth to himself those that are truly faithful. When the evidences of a mans lands are faulty, and the fault past help, men are willing to shuffle all over and rub out as well as they can, but go with many sick thoughts about it, but if there may be any way found they will not be wanting in their endeavours, neither will they spare any cost to settle and establish it. Deal so with thy faith,

bring thy evidences to Councel and what is amisse, let be amended.

SECT. VII.

Helps for the discovery of the truth of our Faith.

FOr our help in this discovery, we must consider,

First, *The soyl, where faith growes.* Every ground will not bear all grain, and every heart is not capable of true faith.

Secondly, *The proper, and true kind and nature of it.* Every plant that doth grow up like it, is not it.

Thirdly, *The means that is to be used for preservation of it.* It will not live and grow without nourishment.

Fourthly, *The fruit that it bears, or effect that it produceth.* True faith is not idle, dead or barren. Some of these, or all of these will lay open thy faith to thee.

The humbled soul the proper soyl for faith.

1. *The soyl where it growes,* is the humble, or rather the humbled soul. The heart rent, torn, broken, and nothing in its own eyes is the proper seat of it. You may as soon find a fair rich garden, or a fruitful corn-field upon an hard rock, or in ground where no plough hath toucht, as you can find faith in an heart not cast down, but lift up in it self. This we may see in the opposition put by the Prophet, *Hab.* 2. 4. *His soul which is lifted up is not upright in him, but the just shall live by his faith.* The heart is sometimes said to be lift up for God, high in resolutions and actings in his obedience, 2 *Chron.* 17. 6. This is not done, but by the strength of faith. The unbelieving soul in the wayes of heaven is low, and dastardly; but the lift-up heart in this place of the Prophet, is an heart high in it self, never yet brought down to the sight of its own defiled and deplored condition; and this is put in opposition to the believing heart. This soul little heeds a threat, as little regards a promise, sees no necessity of reliance upon Christ, and hath no strength for obedience. The opposite to this is the believing soul, and that is the humbled soul, brought down in sense and sight of its own condition.

condition. Humiliation, as the word bears, is a bringing down, laying low, and rendring base and contemptible, and this is the most proper acceptation, and in Scripture variously used; 1. As the act of God upon man, or any society of men, as, *Deut.* 8.2, 3. 1 *Sam.* 2.7. 2 *Cor.* 12.21. 2. The act of man upon man, one man upon another; and this, either to make sinfully vile, filthily low; so the defiling of a woman is called humbling her, *Levit.* 21.14. *Ezek.* 22.10, 11. or to make outwardly low and mean; so *Nebuchadnezzar* took an oath of *Zedekiah*, and brought him under homage, *to make the Kingdome base*, Ezek. 17. 14. 3. As the act of man upon himself, and this also either to make sinfully vile, as the sons of *Eli made themselves vile*, 1 Sam. 3.13. or outwardly vile, and so the Lord Christ for our sakes *humbled himself*, Phil. 2.8. And as the word is used to make low, or render vile, so also to esteem, repute and account as low, and vile: Sin brings a man lower then the dunghill, then the dungeon, and man hath made himself so by sin. When we see our selves in this low estate, and are brought to a sense and acknowledgment of it, then we are humble, then we humble our selves; and the soul that is brought into this frame, is the soyl in which faith takes, and kindly growes. Such a soul sees nothing but want, and therefore is glad of supplyes: sees nothing but danger, and therefore is glad of support, and deliverance. As the lift-up heart will not come to Christ, that it may have life, being under no sense of death, so these cannot be kept from Christ. The soul which is naturally high and lofty, is not in Gods ordinary way wrought into this frame without some sensible work upon it, being so foul, and yet in its own eyes clean; so wretched, and yet in its own thoughts happy; it must be brought to conviction in order to conversion; it must by the Law be brought to see sin, before it will be washt from it, or will seek a pardon of it. There must be *John Baptists* to make way for Christ, some soul-shakings, before the sweet and still voyce of Gospel-comforts. Something indeed may be said, as to those, that with *Timothy* have been trained up from childhood, in the knowledge of Scriptures, and with *John Baptist* sanctified in the womb, for the abatement of this soul-humbling, and shaking work, as to the degree of it, though not to the total exclusion. They were not capable to make observation of the pollution of sin, till they were in their measure by

the Spirit cleanſed, nor to know the danger of ſin, till they were juſtified and acquitted; yet even in thoſe, there is ſo much of the reliques of ſin, and remainders of corruption, that upon diſcovery of their inconformity in ſuch a meaſure to the will of God, they cannot want ſome workings of Spirit. But as to thoſe that live all their dayes, and never apprehend any thought of fear by reaſon of ſin, nor ever called the ſtate of their ſoul into queſtion, but have alwaies carried it in the ſame plight; Among all the queſtions that they have put in their lives, about their health, their eſtates, the nature of their grounds, or how to carry on their Trades (beſides thoſe multiplyed ones of meer vanity and inconſiderable concernment) they never had it in their thoughts to move a queſtion of any concernment to their ſoules. The young mans queſtion, the Jaylours queſtion, *Peters* hearers queſtion, never came into their heads. I have ſeen little evidence of good in theſe; and I ſee little ground to believe any thing of faith in their ſoules. You may ſpeak of ſome of theſe, as of men of good diſpoſitions, of a fair nature, and harmleſſe life and courſe; theſe may grow up in nature moralized and regulated, when yet faith is far from them: they may grow up high in profeſſion, but growing in the blade, or leaf onely, and not in the root, they may juſtly be ſuſpected. Every tree that bears a fair leaf, doth not bear good fruit; and every apple of a fair colour is not to be deſired for food. Such fruit as this, may take where faith will not grow. The Prophets words then ſhould be heeded, *Break up your fallow ground, and ſow not amongſt thornes:* this way muſt be taken for ſoul-humbling, that men may be brought to believing.

The nature of faith wherein it conſiſts. A neceſſary prerequiſite in faith.

2. The next way of diſcovery is, to take notice of *the proper and true kind, the genuine nature of this grace.* And here I hope, the Chriſtiau Reader may reape a double advantage; Firſt to underſtand what faith is, and the requiſites in it. Secondly, helps for proof of themſelves, whether they be in the faith. And here we may obſerve; Firſt, a neceſſary prerequiſite of faith. Secondly, the eſſential parts of it. The prerequiſite to it is knowledge; which ſome indeed make a part of faith; but faith, I ſuppoſe, rather preſuppoſeth it, then is made up of it. The eſſential parts, are either in the underſtanding, or in the will, or affections; for faith is an act of the ſoul, and the whole ſoul is implyed in it. Firſt, then of that which I make a prerequiſite. Knowledge

ledge, is in that way required to the making up of faith, that is often put for faith, as, *Iſai.* 53. 11. And when God works to faith, he is ſaid to open the eyes, or to work to knowledge or light, *Heb.* 10.32. *Act.* 26.18. We come to faith by hearing, we muſt therefore hear, and know, before we can believe. Knowledge is the firſt act or work of the ſoul that conducerh towards faith in the heart; Now knowledge is threefold. Firſt, of ſenſe, we know what we ſee; *Thomas* knew Chriſt, that is the perſon of Chriſt, when he had ſeen his wounds, and put his finger into them. This knowledg is not neceſſarily required in faith, Chriſt there ſaith, , *Bleſſed is he that ſeeth not, and believeth*, John 20. 23. And the Apoſtle ſaith that faith *is the evidence of things not ſeen.* Secondly, of reaſon; we know thoſe things which our reaſon is able to reach; This knowledge runs through all ſciences, in which we attain knowledge by diſcourſe; and the clearer head, the better Artiſt, and the more of knowledge. This we do not require to the being of faith, though faith be not alwaies againſt, yet it is oft above all our reaſonings; yea, our reaſonings, and hammerlng out concluſions are oftentimes againſt faith. The word of faith beats down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth it ſelf againſt the knowledg of God, and brings into captivity every thought, 2. *Cor.* 10. 5. Our *Notionaliſts* are indeed men of ſublimated underſtandings, in caſe they can alwaies reach unto that which according to the Goſpell they are to believe. Thirdly, of authority, we judge our ſelves to know a thing which men worthy of credit do make known: and if we receive the witneſſe of men, ſaith the Apoſtle, the witneſſe of God is greater, 1. *John* 5. 9. The teſtimony of man gives a morall certainty; and ſuch that we will not queſtion. The multiplication of witneſſes renders our knowledge grounded on ſuch authority, more firm; and therefore the proverb, in a well qualified ſenſe, is at leaſt near to truth; *Vox populi, vox Dei. The voice of the people unanimouſly witneſſing, is as the voice of God.* We do no more doubt that there was a maſſacre of Proteſtants in *Ireland*, about the year 41. then we do, that there was one reſolved upon at *Shuſhan* in the reign of *Ahaſhuerus*, Eſth. 3. The teſtimony of God is alwaies of infallible truth, as to the ſubſtance, ſo to every circumſtance of it: many paſſages about that maſſacre we may juſtly queſtion: ſo we muſt not any thing which divine verity hath made known. This knowledge we require in faith,

faith, and know it to be necessary to the being of faith; we must know that God hath revealed in his Word, a Trinity of Persons, or else we shall believe no such thing, as three distinct subsistences in God, that the holy Ghost is God, that Christ is God, and man in one person, or else we shall believe no such doctrine. We must know the creation, from the Scriptures, or else we shall not believe a creation, but run into that opinion, that all things have ever been, as they are. We must know the offices of Christ, or else we shall not believe that any such office was undertaken by him. The same we may say of every doctrine of faith; perhaps without Scripture, we might have known somewhat confusedly of some of them: as that there is a God, and that the world had a beginning: but we should have known nothing at all of many of them; and nothing distinctly of any of them. These we must know, and from the Scriptures of God know, or else we cannot believe; we may as easily see, where nothing is to be seen, as believe where that is not known which is to be believed. Ignorant persons therefore, that know not the right hand from the left in religion, and are to seek in the very first principles of the Oracles of God, in the very beginnings of the doctrine of Christ; that either come not to hear, that they may learn, or that learn nothing at all by hearing; *ever learning and never coming to the knowledge of the truth*, are in an incapacity of faith. Men weak in knowledg can hardly make proof of their faith, they do not well know the nature, or lively workings of it, & so want the comfort, but not the thing. Men without knowledge, are without faith, & have not gone the first step towards it.

The essentiall parts of faith.

1. In the understanding. An assent.

The essentiall parts of it, are (as we have said) in the understanding, will and affections. In the understanding, there is an assent to that which is revealed, upon the authority of him that doth reveal it. When we believe any thing upon that account, that we suppose we see a reason of it, as that the middle region of the ayr is coldest, or that the Sun is in many degrees bigger then the Earth, that we may call an opinion. That which by reason we can certainly conclude, we may call knowlege; but that which we believe upon the credit of him that speaks it, that is faith or belief. This is so of the being of faith, that without it there is no faith, neither humane nor divine; *The Nobleman of Israel*, 2 Kings 7. 1. *Zachary* the father of *John Baptist*, Luk 1. 18. *Martha*, John 11. 39, 40. were all of them herein faulty.

ty. This Truth of God, was above their reason, and therefore they suspended their faith in it. We believe not what man saith, when we do not assent to the truth of that which he speaks: and we believe not what God speaks further then we assent to the truth of his Word. Thus far the devills go, having sufficient experience of the Truth of God; and thus far and further we must go, if we be in the faith. Now this assent hath these two properties; first, It is *Firm*; secondly, *Unlimitted, absolute*, and full. First, firm. Not alwaies free from assaults and doubtings; Satan and our own hearts will muster up objections, but such that yeilds not, but withstands, and overcomes doubtings, holds firm to truth when all means are used to wrest from it. Herein *Eve* failed, God had said, *The day that ye eat ye shall surely die*; Satan brought such objections, that upon his word she believed, that she should procure good to her self, and not incur evil by eating, and so yielded to unbelief, upon Satans reasonings. As our assent must be firm, so also absolute and unlimitted to the whole of all that God speaks, such was the faith of *Paul*, *Acts* 24.14. *Believing all things which are written in the Law, and the Prophets*: and Christ blames the two Disciples that their faith was not such, *Luk.* 24. 25. How little honour do we give to man, when sometimes we give credit and belief to that which he saies, because we see reason and probability of truth in his words, and at other times call all to question that he speaks? such is the honour that many give to God, when they pick and choose in believing, as they do in obeying. Promises must be believed in the way of Gods tender of them, with limit to the conditions annexed to them; Threatnings must be believed upon those grounds that they are menaced; commands must be believed, that is Gods soveraignty in them, the justice and equity of them and a necessity of our yielding to them. As it must be an assent to the whole Word of God: So it must be an assent to it, in that sense as God propounds it. The Word in that sense that it gives of it self, is the Word of God, and not otherwise; when we put our sense upon it, we make it our word not Gods. Where we must not condemn all for unbelief, that are any waies subject to mistakes, or that through weakness of judgment, do not apprehend every thing as it is. Willing and wilfull wrestings of the Word are here spoke against: when carnall reasonings, out of singularity, vain-glory, carnall contentment, hope of gain, and admiration

1. Firm.

2: Absolute and unlimited.

admiration of men are set up against the Truth of God; if we should go no further in our scrutiny, how many would be found unsound in the faith? Have we not those that are so far from any close adherence to truth tendred, that every wind tosseth them to and fro, and drives them up and down? that hold no longer in an opinion, then a mimick gallant keeps in a fashion, and change their faith as these do their dresse? Have we not those that believe, where they list; and that is, where it may serve for their advantage, or repute, but where they list not, they can deny all faith to any truth that God speaks, & deny it they wil, where they see it tends to their danger? No swearer, no drunkard, no adulterer, no extorting oppressor, &c. can believe the truth of God in his Word; but he must with it believe his own condemnation.

2. In the will with the affections.

But faith is a work of the whole soul, and implyes the will with the affections, as well as the understanding. Faith is expresst in Scripture, by *our coming to Christ*, Joh. 6. 35. And that is a work of the will, and not of the mind: of the judgement, and not of the affections. It is called a receiving of Christ, *Joh.* 1. 12. this is also done by the will and affections. Consideration, and deliberation are works of the understanding; but choise and imbracing, are works of the will; when the woman of *Samaria*, *Joh.* 4. 29. saith, *Is not this the Messiah?* There was matter of consideration, and deliberation; there was work for the understanding to be imployed in; whether he were to be acknowledged indeed the Messiah. But now to leave all, and follow Christ, to forsake all, and cleave to him: This is matter of choise, and work for the will and affections, whose work it is to take, or refuse. Therefore as faith is set out in Scripture by words implying knowledge, and assent; so likewise by words implying affiance, trust, rolling, casting a mans self on the Lord. Faith then takes Christ, and cleaves to him; in all of those relations in which a Christian stands to Christ, takes Christ and lookes for no other delight or comfort; takes Christ and will not indure any other Lord, or commander; takes Christ and lookes for no other helper; takes Christ and lookes for no other Saviour; takes Christ as a Saviour, and trusts in him; takes Christ as an husband, and delights in him; takes Christ as a Lord, and obeyes him. Thus according to the several offices that Christ does, there are several actings of faith for to answer.

swer. The great work of Christ was, *to give his soul an offering for sin*, to shed his blood to take away our guilt, there faith answers, and it is not alone said, that they *that believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the Law of Moses*, which might imply no more then a qualification of the person to be justified; but it is further said that Christ is *set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood*, Rom. 3 25. which plainly denotes the instrument whereby we have our interest. When there are many acts of faith, that which respects his blood, alone doth justifie. Christ is set up as a King, and hath all things put in subjection under him. Here faith yields up all to him, and consents as to be saved, so to be ruled by him. Christ in his Kingly power protects as well as commands; as he holds out a Scepter, so he is a shield. Faith flyes unto him for shelter, and so receives and quenches all Satans darts. Christ is given as an head to his body the Chuch, not onely for command, but for quickning and enlivening power, to supply with vitall energies every part and member. Here faith answers, and takes in from Christ the Spirit by the promises for life and power; and so the life, that we live in the flesh, is by faith in Christ Jesus. So that faith I suppose may be fitly defined to be, *A firm assent of mind to the whole truth of God, in the way that he doth reveal it, with an acceptation of all that good which God confers by Christ in the way that he doth tender it.* I know this grace is diversly held out, and is so comprehensive, that the full nature of it is not easily laid open; A common definition of it is, that it is, *A resting upon Christ alone for salvation*; purposely given, to correct their mistake, that have made assurance, or a full perswasion that what Christ hath done, I shall enjoy in particular, to be of the nature and essence of faith. But though this may vertually comprize all that is required in this grace, yet it is no full and explicite definition of it; for unlesse the understanding give its assent that salvation is alone by Christ, the will cannot rest upon him for it. This assent in that definition is presupposed: But it is convenient that it should be expert. Other things besides salvation are received by faith from Christ, but salvation is the most eminent and principall, and all other as by consequent depend upon it. This that I have delivered, is more explicitely full; not onely virtually, but expresly holds out all that faith compriseth. And as all of those are here as we have heard convinced of unbelief, that know not those necessary truths that God hath made known, and upon that ac-

count can give no assent, together with those that believe, even in necessary and fundamentall doctrines, otherwise then God hath revealed, that pick and choose in doctrines of faith, assenting or denying assent at pleasure; So also all those that give other things the preheminence above Christ, or at least take them in in coordination with him. When Christ is offered in the Gospel to the soul, and men are urged by his Ministers to receive him, for life and happinesse, the things of the world are still ready to make tender of themselves: *The lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, the pride of life*; that is, profits, pleasures, honours; When these are hugged, prosecuted, and followed, Christ is refused and slighted. A covetous man will make sail of Christ for a piece of silver; he will lay out more strength of affection to compasse earth, in the way of a calling, then to compasse Christ in Ordinances. The man of pleasures will sell Christ for his cups, for his sports, for his wantonnesse; the like we may say of the man of honours. He that for the cause of Christ can forsake and abjure all, is the onely man in whom Christ by faith makes his residence.

The necessary nourishment of faith.

Thus we have seen the two first wayes for the tryal of faith: the third followes, which is, *The means appointed for the nourishment and strength of it.* It cannot live unlesse in the use of means it be kept up. Declensions are apt to appear in soul as well as in body. He observes little about his spiritual estate, that does not see his faith oftentimes apt to languish as well as his health. And though we be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation; yet it is in the use of means, and not otherwise. He therefore that lives in faith, is careful in the use of means to keep faith alive. The means appointed of God for this end are especially, the Word, Sacraments, and Prayer.

1. The Word.

The Word is food as well as seed; as it plants, so it waters; as it begins, so it perfects the work of grace. When *Paul* left the *Ephesians*, whom he had begotten to the faith through the Gospel; he leaves them this Legacy, *Act.*20.32. We are *born again of the immortal seed of the Word*, 1Pet.1.23. and *as new born babes*, we must desire the *sincere milk of the Word, that we may grow thereby.* 1 Pet.2.2. No man ever knew a child live without the breast, or other suitable means for nourishment; Nor men of strength without answerable sustenance; no more can a man in grace live without the Word of grace. Our imaginations and carnal

carnal reasonings will be stirring and working, and faith hath not a more deadly enemie. The Word which is the sword of the Spirit, must beat those down, and hold them under, 2 *Cor.* 10.5. The word of promise underproppes our faith, and must be frequently heard, diligently heeded, or else it cannot be upheld. Those therefore that prize the Word, as a child the dug, esteeming it with *Job*, as their ordinary food, *Job.*23.12. and to this end, to keep life in their souls, faith in their hearts; here is a sign both of life and growth: but when it is with men, as with *Israel* in the wilderneſſe, their soul loatheth this heavenly Manna, as light bread; having their appetite far better pleased with other things, their ear being of the temper of *Jeremies* hearers, *The Word of the Lord is a reproach to them, they have no delight in it*, Jer.6.10. these never had faith in the power and life. And all they that lose in their love to the Word, lose also in their faith. Many here might be convinced to be wanting in this righteousnesse upon their want of faith to interest themselves in it.

1. Those that take themselves to be above any necessity of hearing, having learnt as they think so much, that they may now well lay aside their teachers. God vouchsafing of grace those gifts for the perfecting of the Saints, having gained (as they think) perfection, they matter no more intermedling with them. If these could shew us any Scripture-Saint, that ever reached to this height, or ever set upon any such resolution; or if they could give such experience to all that know them, that they might know that they want nothing of the highest top of perfection, then they said something. But when the highest of Saints that we read of in the Word, highly prized the Word, and the more high they were, the more high prize they put upon it, and these that upon this pretence reject it, proclaime to the vvorld many vvants in their souls; even in that vvhich lyeth at the very bottome of faith, and is of greatest necessity to the being of it, their knovvledge being but in part, in most of these very lovv; and little or nothing, vvhere most should be knovvn; vve may vvell conclude that all this talke of perfection is vain. Take tvvo persons, the one of them talking and boasting of vvealth, & the other labouring hard in tillage or trade to gain vvealth, and if you can tell whether of these, the talker, or the labourer, is like to encrease in substance, then you have determined the question, whether these unruly talkers that boast of faith, or those that diligently

attend on Ordinances for gaining of it, are more richly ſtored with it. 2. Thoſe that neglect to hear, or hear onely at their idle leiſure, judging a buſineſſe that may be done, but ſee little neceſſity of doing of it, would pretend not to deſpiſe it, yet put a very ſleight eſteem upon it. Doth the child judge ſo of the dug? Or do theſe judge ſo of their ordinary and neceſſary food? A life of nature is kept up in the uſe of meanes as long as it can be pateht up; if Phyſick be neglected, ſo is not food. The Word is food and phyſick for the life of grace, and this is let alone. 3. Thoſe that careleſly, negligently, ſuperciliouſly, and diſdainfully hear, as though their buſineſſe were not to feed, but judge; not to learn or be minded of any thing, but onely to cenſure. According as the way of their fancy works, ſo the Word takes. Some are pleaſed onely with Kickſhawes, like ſuch diſhes on a table, that have ſhew without ſubſtance, words that are quaint and ſtrained, not to help, but to exceed their underſtandings. Others with choyce notions onely; how wholeſome ſoever, it is not worth heeding, if not curious. Others take up all according to the perſon that delivers it; with children they are pleaſed with every thing from one hand, with nothing from another. Laſtly, Thoſe that let go all truths as ſoon as they are heard; There is no more heard of the Sermon when once it is done. They that go to a feaſt will talk of the diſhes, and they that go to a Fair or Market will talk of the Commodities; but when they go to the Congregation, there is not a ſyllable heard of the Word after they return. When meat goes out of the ſtomach as it comes in, it neither ſtrengtheneth nor nouriſheth; and the Word ſlipt as ſoon as it is heard, can be no more effectual.

2. Sacraments. Sacraments are viſible ſigns and ſeals. That of Baptiſme enters us into the Church viſible, and ſeals all the promiſes made to members, on Gods terms and propoſitions. And the Supper of the Lord is for confirmation of thoſe that are viſibly Church-members on the ſame terms likewiſe.

Baptiſme is paſt in the act; but ſtill preſent in the uſe. As a Souldier by oath taken, and colours given was tied to his General: ſo we are hereby tyed unto God, and God is tyed unto us; and hereby we know our duty, and Gods promiſe. As a leaſe binds to duty and aſſures a benefit, ſo it is with the Sacrament of Baptiſme. The Apoſtle, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. compares it to the Ark of *Noah*, he was there toſt up and down in the deep, conſidering

his

his present state, he might well have feared shiprack; but the Ark being of Gods apointment, and he put into it by Gods command, he might well confide in him for safety. If we look to the temptations and assaults, wherewith our souls are on all hands battered, we have just cause of fears; but when we call to mind that we entered the Church (as *Noah* the Ark) by Baptisme, and make it our business that conscience may answer unto what Baptisme requires, what objection soever our heart makes, Baptisme may raise our souls in confident assurance. The Lords Supper is to the eye, as the promises are to the eare. Whilest we are in the body, spiritual things under corporal signs are ordained for our help and strength. Our Saviour tells us, *his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed*, John 6. 55. And here under the signs of that which is our ordinary meat and drink, the flesh and blood of Christ is tendered, and as our food is offered unto us. Where these Sacraments have their due esteem, and men baptized in infancy, do not passe by the thoughts of it in their growth, but well consider their engagements and bonds that lye upon them to presse them to duty, and the engagements of God for support of their faith, they then make use of this ordinance, to uphold faith and keep life in it, in their souls; when they frequent the Lords Table, and conscienciously communicate, for the ends for which it was instituted, to be laid low in themselves, to see sin aggravated and pardon tendred, there is like hopes: But when all thoughts of Baptisme is laid aside, and the Lords Supper either neglected or prophaned; these may well look, that as a child through want of food, so their faith upon the same account may languish.

3. Prayer.

Prayer is the daughter of faith, and also the nurse or fostermother. Faith breathes out it self in prayer, and prayer obtains a more ample measure of faith to pray. *Lord, I believe, help my unbelief, was the prayer of the father of the Lunatick*, Mark 9. 24. and *Lord encrease our faith*, was the prayer of the Apostles, *Luk.* 17. 5. When we have done all to stand, prayer in the Spirit, *Ephes* 6. 18. must second. This Communion with God keeps up faith in God: They that make it their work to pray alwayes, ever holding it up in the season of it, joyning with the Congregation in publique, in the family in a way more private, and after Christs counsel in their closet, sending forth holy ejaculations in their beds, their walks, and on all occasions; These take

take care of their faith. But in case that may be truly said of them, which was falsly laid to the charge of *Job*, that *they restrain prayer before God*, Job 15. 4. their faith may justly be suspected. I may speak concerning this grace in the words of the Apostle, these *have not, because they ask not*: these starve their faith, and let it dye through want of nourishment and support. We hear of Camelions that live in the ayr, and Salamanders in the fire; A Wonder was not long since noysed out of *Germany*, of a Maid that lived onely on the smell of flowers; An impostor lately went from place to place that fed on stones: these that would passe for believers are some such Monsters. Thus we have lookt into faith according to the three first rules, the last followes, which is, *the fruit that it beares, or the effects that it produceth*; These might be reduced into two heads. First, such as all faith, if true, produceth. Secondly, such as onely a strong and grown faith obtaineth. But calling men to the tryal whether they be in the faith; and not whether they be high, and transcendent in believing; I shall wave the latter, and speak onely to the former. These fruits which every faith (which is such in truth) produceth, are either in the understanding, or affections.

The fruits which faith bears, and the effects which it produces.

For that which it produceth in the understanding, take this rule. *Faith puts that high prize on Christ, and priviledges through Christ, that all earthly things are comparatively of the meanest value, and most low esteem.* This we might make good in divers instances. 1. In *Moses*. If we read the beginning Chapters of *Exodus*, we may there see the sad afflicted estate of the people of God in that time, together with the honour to which *Moses* by a wonder of providence was advanc'd. In this honour of his, and low ebbe of theirs, *it came into his heart to visite his brethren the children of Israel*, Act. 7. 23. He could not drink wine in bowls, and anoint himself with the chiefest oyntments, and not grieve for the afflictions of *Joseph*: and see the the Comment that the Apostle makes upon it, *Heb.* 11. 24, 25, 26. *By faith Moses when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaohs daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season: Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches then the treasures in Egypt.* *David* in the Wilderness of *Judea* was persecuted by *Saul*; all his honours at Court were lost; yea, all

1. In the Understanding.

live-

livelihood and way of subsistence gone; yet penning a Psalm in the midst of those exigents, none of these are named on that day that he speaks of the fruition of Christ in Ordinances, as, *Psal.* 63. may be seen. *Paul*, Phil. 3. 5, 6. layes open the rich priviledges that according to the flesh could be looked after, and such that sometimes he himself did admire, *but these things that were gain to him, he counted losse for Christ*; yea, he professeth himself to account them but *dung*, when they stood in competition with Christ. Compare the greatest of things that can be in thy desire, and dung together, and these will certainly stand in a great disproportion; yet such is the disproportion between Christ and the greatest priviledges upon earth in a believers thoughts. When the world hath a low and despicable opinion of Christ, and men of the world are ready to say, *He hath no form nor comelinesse; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him*: All that is spoke of him in Gospel-Ordinances, with them is dull and flat; as was said of *Sion, This is Sion which no man looketh after*; So it may be said of the King of *Sion*. Men of faith are of another opinion; He is to them *the chiefest of ten thousand*, Cant. 5. 10. and stands in their thoughts above all comparison. *As the apple-tree among the trees of the Wood, so is my beloved among the sons*, saith the Spouse, *Cant.* 2. 3. If men would now look into their hearts, whether Christ and the great things of Christ, or the world and the great things of the world have this esteem, they might thence draw a strong conjecture whether they be in the Faith, or whether their hearts are void of it; which estimate of their Judgments may appear in their care and pains to compasse, as also in their trouble upon the losse that accrues unto them. If their care to compasse the world be great, so that they rise up early, and eat the bread of carefulnesse, the world having all command of their affections to screw them up to it self, and put them on to improve their diligence to the utmost, and in the mean time Ordinances are in low esteem, and every way that Christ is compassed of mean regard, businesses justling out prayers, and the week-dayes employment in servile labours taking up the Sabbath-dayes duties, when worldly affaires are followed with eagernesse, and holy undertakings are done with earthly thoughts, wearisomly, as against the hair, here is a cause of suspition. Troubles in and about losses may be as great a discovery, as cares to compasse; If they were in

Lots

Lots Wives caſe to run away from all, and for Chriſt to leave it to fire, plunder, confiſcation, would not they then with a wiſhly eye look after them, and have ſad parting thoughts about them, inſtead of joyfully ſuffering the ſpoyl of them? And upon apprehenſions that things go ill upon any emergent occaſions at once, to the hazard of outward things, and the endangering of Ordinances, in caſe they are ſenſible of the former, and are as men ſenſleſſe of the latter, having more wiſhes that taxes were taken off, then that the Goſpel ſhould flouriſh; here's a true *Gadarene* that would part with Chriſt rather then his ſwine. The world, and not Chriſt in Ordinances, is the Pearl for which they will make ſale of all.

2. In the Affections.

As to the fruit, or effect that Faith produceth in the affections, take theſe rules: 1. *Faith is againſt all whatſoever that is againſt Chriſt. As it ſets Chriſt in the higheſt room, ſo it oppoſeth all that oppoſeth him, and will not ſuffer the moſt deſired luſt that divides from him.* As the covetous mans luſt carries him to his gold, the wantons luſt to his *Dalilah*, the drunkards to his cups, and breaks through all oppoſition in their way of fruition of them; ſo a believers Faith carries him to his Chriſt, and will not abide any temptation or luſt in his way of intereſt in him, *Acts* 15. 9. We may ſee that Jewes and Gentiles are either of both of unclean hearts, and that it is onely God that cleanſeth and purifieth; as he makes the heart ſoft, ſo he makes it clean; and faith is the inſtrument wherewith it is thus cleanſed. Luſt defiles, 1 *Pet.* 2. 4. and faith purifies. It is Luſt that divides from Chriſt; *They that are Chriſt's, crucifie the fleſh with the luſts thereof*, Gal. 5. 24. and that upon account of eternal fruition of him. *She that is married careth how ſhe may pleaſe her husband*, 1 Cor. 7. 34. ſhe is not to go in any manner of attire or dreſſe to pleaſe her ſelf, but in that which may pleaſe him. That which he diſlikes, ſhe muſt caſt off. The believer is betrothed to Chriſt, his care then is to walk in all well-pleaſing, and to caſt off all that doth diſpleaſe him. If men can do that for Chriſt, which the *Galatians* were ready to do for *Paul*, even to pluck out their eyes for his ſake, rather then loſe him, then all is well; but if they look into their thoughts, and ſee that there is any thing dear unto them which is abhorrent to Chriſt, any thing which they love, that he loatheth, whether it be inward filthineſſe, as pride, vain-glory, earthly-mindedneſſe,

&c.

&c. or outward uncleanneſſe, as drunkenneſſe, whoredomes, &c. this evidences a total want of grace in their ſoules. A believing drunkard, a believing adulterer, a believing extorting oppreſſor, as to aſſent to the doctrine of faith and profeſſion of it, may well ſtand together; and reading the Scriptures, and looking among Chriſtian profeſſours, we may find too many ſuch believers; but as to the grace of faith, they ſtand in full oppoſition to it; and in this ſenſe we may juſtly ſay, there is not a believing drunkard, or covetous worldling upon the earth. As our Saviour ſaid concerning thoſe devils that had held their haunt in the young man from infancy, that his diſciples could not caſt them out becauſe of their unbelief; ſo I may ſay of all that caſt not out theſe luſts. It was weakneſſe in the diſciples faith that diſabled them, that they could not caſt devils out of others: It is want of faith that diſableth theſe that they cannot caſt them out of themſelves. 2. *Faith makes that reſolute choyce of Chriſt, that it ſuffers all manner of afflictions rather than to be driven and divided from him. After ye were illuminated,* (ſaith the Apoſtle to the believing *Hebrewes*) *ye ſuffered a great fight of afflictions*, Heb. 10. 32. To ſave the labour of turning over large Volumes of Martyrologies, read over that little book of Martyrs, as ſome have called, *Heb.* 11. eſpecially, ver. 35, 36, 37, 38. Faith kindles that flame that many waters cannot quench. Chriſt upon earth was a man of ſorrowes, and acquainted with griefs, yet he had thoſe diſciples that never left him, till he came to the Croſſe, and then ſollicitouſly enquired after him. Where Chriſt dwells by faith, there the Spirit ſtrengthens for ſufferings, *Epheſ.* 3. 16, 17. If men now look into their hearts, and ſee themſelves willing to follow Chriſt in fair weather, and to own his cauſe whileſt it coſts them nothing, but in worldly reſpects rather gain by the bargain; but when trouble ariſeth, they are gone; Theſe may look into the Parable of the ſower, whether this be not an evidence of a rocky and ſtony heart. A ſtrong wind is the tryal of the root of the tree, of the foundation of the houſe; an hot ſcorching fire of the truth of the mettal. It is true, that ſelf-ends ſometimes put a man upon ſufferings; But it is alwayes true, that ſelf-ends onely put a man upon profeſſion, when he will not ſtand out in ſufferings. They whoſe Religion is the States Religion, the Times Religion, will not loſe an hair by any profeſſion they make; Self and not Faith carries on that

profeſſion. 3. As faith carries the ſoul up to Chriſt to be one with him, ſo alſo it carries it on in every affection and office of love to his brethren. *In Jeſus Chriſt, neither Circumciſion availeth any thing, nor uncircumciſion, but faith which worketh by love*, Gal. 5. 6. It is not to be of this opinion, or of that, which men call their faith; nor of this Nation, nor of that, which too oft preſcribes all that men in their way of faith believe; But to be poſſeſt of that faith which works by love, which commends us unto God. A man may be of this or that faith according to pleaſure, and yet his faith utterly deſtitute of that grace. Faith carries a man not any further at all towards Chriſt then his love carries him on towards his brethren. An idle faith is a dead faith, and a dead faith never reacheth righteouſneſſe to Juſtification and life. *James* never diſputed againſt *Paul's* aſſertion of Juſtification by faith onely: Writing after him (as is generally confeſt) he did not write to contradict any doctrine, or correct any errours delivered by him. When *Paul* concludes Juſtification by faith, *James* concludes that it is by a working faith; Where it works not, it doth not then juſtifie; and where it works to acceptation, it works by love.

CHAP. XIII. SECT. I.

Of the number of Sacraments.

AS a reſult from all that hath been ſaid of the nature and uſe of Sacraments, we may conclude the definite and diſtinct number of them. So many Ordinances that we can find in Old or New Teſtament-Scriptures, that are ſigns and ſeales of this nature, as here hath been ſet out from the Apoſtles words, ſo many Sacraments there are truly ſo called, equally worthy of that honour of Sacraments with this of Circumciſion, being every way of the ſame nature and uſe, they are deſervedly to have the ſame eſteem. But falling ſhort of ſuch, they are to have eſteem as they are, and their dignity may challenge, but not to be put into this number. And I know no other way then this to find out the ſet and definite number of them. Thoſe trifling arguments made uſe of by ſome, that the matter of

The way to find out the number of Sacraments.

New

New Teſtament-Sacraments, viz. *Water* and *Blood*, came out of the ſide of Chriſt, and that *blood* and *water*, as *John* affirms, bear witneſſe on earth, are not worthy to be mentioned, ſave onely that they are uſed by ſome of eminent name. And upon diligent ſearch we ſhall find onely two ſtated, ſtanding Ordinances in Old Teſtament-Scriptures, and onely two in New Teſtament-Scriptures, that are to be thus received. We have not indeed any diſtinct Text in either of both Teſtaments, expreſly teſtifying that there are two, and two onely Sacraments, as we find it ordinarily in Catechiſmes. Neither is there any diſtinct Text in the Law or Prophets, that *as we would that men ſhould do to us, ſo we ſhould do to them.* Yet our Saviour, *Matth.* 7. 12. tells us, that that rule is both in the Law and in the Prophets, being a clear reſult from that which the Law and the Prophets have delivered. The like may we ſay concerning the number of Sacraments. It is as clear a reſult from that which is delivered to us both from Old and New Teſtament-Scriptures; ſo that the concluſion is twofold, drawn by way of deduction of this nature.

1. There were in Old Teſtament-times onely two ſtanding Ordinances of the nature of Sacraments, *viz.* Circumciſion and the Paſſeover.

2. There are in New Teſtament-times onely two Sacraments, *viz.* Baptiſme and the Lords Supper.

Two onely ſtanding Ordinances in the Old Teſtament of the nature of Sacraments. Two onely Sacraments in the New Teſtament.

We ſhall begin with Old Teſtament-times; and here our way of diſcovery is; Firſt, To find out all thoſe Signes, or Ordinances that are ſet up in competition as Sacraments. Secondly, To enquire into the nature and uſe of them. Thirdly, To find out how nigh they come to the nature of Sacraments, and what agreement they have with them. Fourthly, where it is that they are defective, and fall ſhort of Sacraments truly ſo called.

SECT. II.

Rainbowe no Sacrament.

The definition of a Rainbow.

THe first that offers it self is the Rainbowe, of which we might speak; First, as it is in nature, for discovery of the physical being of it. Secondly, as a sign appointed of God. But the first consideration of it is not my business, but the work of Philosophers; who out of *Aristotle* have defined it tobe, *A Bowe of many colours seated in an hollow and duskish cloud, appearing upon the reflection of the Sun in opposition against it.* He that pleaseth may read further in *Magirus physiol. peripat. lib. 4. cap. 5. Keckerman Syst. Phys. lib. 6. ad finem. Zanch. de oper. Dei, lib. 3. cap. 3. Valesius de Sacrâ Philosoph. cap. 9.* So that the efficient cause is the Sun. The subject in which it appeares is a cloud standing in Diametrical opposition. The thing it self is the reflex of the Sun. The form and shape is a bowe of variety of colours. Whereupon it is generally concluded, that there were bowes of this nature before the flood, the Sun being then in equal vigour to produce it, and clouds in which the reflex might be apparent. And the cause being then as well as now in act, the effect must needs be likewise. But it was from that time, and not before, that it was appointed as a sign; and under that consideration we find it mentioned and largely spoke to, *Gen. 9. 8.* and following verses, *God spake unto Noah and to his sons with him, saying, And I, behold, I establish my Covenant with you, and with your seed after you; And with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattel, and of every beast of the earth with you: from all that go out of the Ark, to every beast of the earth. And I will establish my Covenant with you, neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood, neither shall there be any more a flood to destroy the earth. And God said, This is the token of the Covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations: I do set my bowe in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a Covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to passe, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bowe shall be seen in the cloud: And I will remember my Covenant which is between me and you, and every living*

Gen. 9. 8, &c. opened.

ving creature of all flesh, and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh; and the bowe shall be in the cloud. And I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting Covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the Covenant, which I have established between me, and all flesh that is upon the earth. In which words we may observe, 1. A Covenant entred. 2. The sign whereby it is ratified and confirmed. In the Covenant it self we see, 1. The parties in Covenant, *God* on one part; *Noah*, his sonnes, their seed, every Living Creature on the other part. 2. The nature of this Covenant, absolute, and not conditional, as *Pareus* observes, and therefore it is a Covenant improperly so called, as appears upon a double account. First, In that it is absolute; when a Covenant properly so called, hath its conditions, as elsewhere I have largely shewed. Secondly, In that beasts and birds, that are here parties in Covenant, are subjects capable of receiving mercies, but not of entering into Covenant, no more then the stones of the field are of capacity to enter league with man, as, *Job* 5. 23. or to be witnesses in any cause, as, *Josh.* 24. 17. therefore as a bare command is called a Covenant, *Jer.* 34. 13. as a bare seal is also so called, *Gen.* 17. 10. so promises elsewhere called a Covenant likewise, all of them in an improper sense. In the Covenant we see the mercy promised, ver. 11. not to cut off all flesh any more by a flood. In the sign for ratification and confirmation we may see, 1. The Author. 2. The sign it self, the appearance of a bowe. 3. The place of situation, the Cloud. 4. The way of signification, and that is by institution, as appears in that God sets it for that very end. Some make the Rainbowe a natural sign of that which the text saith is signified by it, which according to them is not that which is generally understood, that God will destroy the world no more by water, but onely that no such deluge shall at that time come when the Rainbowe appears; seeing it is a sign that the Sunne hath got victory over any such clouds, that might have tendency to such a deluge: So *Cajetan*, as he is quoted by *Rivet exercit.* in Gen. who yet (as *Rivet* observes) contradicts himself, in that he saies any deluge of such kind must needs be supernatural. It might then come upon the earth, from the hand of God, at the instant time that the bowe appears, any such natural cause notwithstanding. It is then, no natural, but an instituted sign, to give assurance of the fulfilling of

The Rainbowe hath respect to a Covenant improperly so called,

The Rainbow, an instituted sign.

of this promiſe. Upon ſight of this bowe, we may call to mind, that it is of free grace, that all fleſh does not periſh, and that the waters that are ſo uſeful to us, do not preſently deſtroy us: and to aſſure our ſelves, that through grace we ſhall be kept from periſhing. *Pareus* ſaies that the Jewes upon the appearance of the rainbowe, uſed to go out and make ſuch expreſſe acknowledgments. But open profeſſions of that nature, are in danger to turn to oſtentation, and meer formality, which yet muſt not hold us from our duty in humility, confidence and praiſe to make obſervation of it. Some find fit correſpondencies in the Rainbowe to ſignifie, and ſeal this mercy. Firſt, Becauſe of the place, which is in the clouds of heaven. whence came the rain that drowned the world before. Secondly, Becauſe the bowe is bended upward towards God, not towards the Creature below, as when it is taken in hand, to ſhoot at a mark; nor is there in the bowe any arrow, which is ſaid to be made ready upon the ſtring, when hurt is intended, *Pſal.* 11. 2. Thirdly, becauſe the Rainbowe appeareth commonly with rain; and ſo where men might begin to fear the judgment, there they may take comfort againſt it in that it is a ſign of his Covenant for ſafety. Fourthly, becauſe the Rainbowe appears not, but when there is a clearneſſe and brightneſſe in ſome part of the skie, but at the generall flood it was all black with rain. Fifthly, That the Rainbowe conſiſting of divers colours, by the watery colour is repreſented the overwhelming rain paſt, and not to return; and by the fiery colour is prefigured the deſtruction of the World by the element of fire, as is foretold, 2 *Pet.* 3. 10. Sixthly, Becauſe the Rainbowe where it toucheth upon any ſhrubs, leaveth a very ſweet and fragant ſmell behind; (as ſome Naturaliſts obſerve) it holds out the pleaſant acceptation of God as a ſweet ſmelling ſavour in his noſtrils. But ſeeing that theſe are not taught us in the Word, but found out by men, and *Zanchy* ſaies of them, that they are *piæ*, but *parum firmæ*, I ſhall paſſe them by. And to wind up all that we have to ſay of this thing, we ſee; Firſt, How farre there is an agreement betweene the Rainbowe, and the Sacrament. The Rainbowe we ſee, 1. Is a ſign. 2. A ſign not natural, but by inſtitution. 3. The inſtitution is of God. 4. It is to ſignifie and ſeal a promiſe made of God. Thus farre it is of Sacramental uſe, yet it falls ſhort of a Sacrament properly ſo called in ſeveral particulars. 1. Sacraments are ſignes and ſeales of a Covenant properly ſo called;

Correſpondencyes obſerved by ſome in the Rainbow with the promiſe.

How far the Rainbowe is Sacramental.

How far it falls ſhort of a Sacrament.

called; but here is no Covenant, but such as is. Synechdochically, and improperly such as we have heard. 2. Sacraments are engaging signs, with restipulation; these are absolute, nothing at all being called for from man, much lesse from other creatures. 3. The Covenant people of God are the adequate subject of Sacraments; but here the whole world of mankind, and all flesh is entitled. 4. This is onely to be seen as it is set of God in the Cloud; but Sacraments are to be received, upon tender from God, and not onely beheld. 5. Sacraments are seales of the righteousnesse of faith appointed for ratification of spirituall and saving mercies; but this is onely a ratification of a temporal deliverance. As to this last dissimilitude perhaps some exceptions might be taken. As the Rainbowe was immediately a signe and seal of a temporal mercy, so it was with the Passeover in like manner. The freedome of *Israel* in *Egypt*, when the first born were destroyed, seems to have no more spirituality in it, then our security from a deluge. And in case we make that of *Egypt* a type of a further deliverance in Christ, so we may make this deliverance a figure of like mercy, and so *Zanchy* indeed makes it. And the last Annotations hint such a thing, *Though this Rainbowe* (say they) *be a sign of a temporal Covenant in the general extent of it to all creatures, yet the Godly may look upon it with reference to Christ, in whom all promises of what sort soever, are Yea and Amen, and who is represented sitting in his throne, compassed with a Rainbowe in light like unto an Emerald*, Rev. 4. 3. And in case this sign had been peculiar to the Church, as was that deliverance in *Egypt*, and given of God, onely to his people in Covenant; and in New Testament-Scriptures so applyed, as that of the Passeover is, it had been unquestionable: but being common to the world, all creatures in the world having like interest in it, and there being no touch of it in New Testament-Scriptures, it cannot be so conceived. Onely we may safely yield thus much, that as the godly may see a son-like title to every common mercy in Christ, and not barely as they are to others, a commmon providence and largesse: so they may see the Rainbowe shadowing out a like mercy; but in case this would conclude it to be a Sacrament, every creature enjoyed by a Child of God, would have the nature of a Sacrament likewise.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Sacrifices not Sacraments.

THe next Old Teſtament-ordinances that offer themſelves, as of the nature of Sacraments, are ſacrifices. Theſe being of ſeveral kinds are uſually ranked under four heads, *The Burnt-offering, The Sin-offering, The Treſpaſſe-offering, and the peace-offering.* Some of which alſo admit of ſeveral ſubdiviſions. Other diſtributions of them are alſo made by ſome under other notions, which would be beſides my purpoſe particularly to mention. There is much agreeable to the nature of Sacraments in them. 1. They had their inſtitution from God, as we may ſee in the Levitical Law, and ſo had all ſacrifices that from the beginning the people of God did offer. By *Faith Abel offered a more excellent ſacrifice then Cain*, Heb. 11. 4. And nothing can be done in faith without warranty of a Divine preſcript. 2. Theſe were given in command of God, to his people in Covenant, *Pſal.* 50. 5. *Gather my Saints which have made a Covenant with me by Sacrifice.* 3. Chriſt was held out in theſe Sacrifices, and conſequently, the righteouſneſſe of faith ſignified, as the whole body of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrewes* ſhewes. Some therefore will have them to be Sacraments properly ſo called, and are angry at that Divinity, as they call it, magiſterially impoſed by ſome, that the Jews had but two Sacraments, Circumciſion and the Paſſeover; and oppoſe againſt it, the *Cloud*, the *Sea* which *Iſrael* paſſed through, and *Manna*, and the *Rock*, which were to them inſtead of the Lords Supper; and alſo the Sacrifices under and before the Law, appointed to the people of God. And doubtleſſe they had much of Sacramentality in them, being external rites appointed of God for his people in Covenant, Leading them unto Chriſt and remiſſion of ſinnes by his blood, and the Church (as it appears) for a long time had no other; yet doubtleſſe there are differences to be aſſigned between them. 1. Sacrifices were received of God from the hands of his people, being given to God by man, they were accepted of him. *If the Lord were pleaſed to kill us, he would not have received a burnt-offering, and a meat-offering at our hands*, Judg. 13. 23. But Sacraments (as we have heard) are given of God to be received of his people; *Abraham* offered Sacrifice to God, but he received Circumciſion

Circumcision from God; And the Passeover was to be eaten by those of the family, *Exod.* 12. 4, 10. And though perhaps it may be proved, that the people had liberty to eat of some of their Sacrifices, yet that was not the proper end, and reason of them, as it was of the Passeover. The people brought them to offer rather then to eat of them. 2. These Sacrifices led men unto Christ for attonement, by him to attain it; Sacraments are to seal up an attonement made, and already actually perfected, upon Gods terms to be applyed to us in particular. And so their difference from Sacraments properly so called is evident.

SECT. IV.

The Cloud, the Sea, Manna, and the Rock were Sacraments extraordinary.

THe next that offer themselves to our consideration, are those providences of God over his people, as they passed out of *Egypt*, and whilest they were in the Wilderness; and these are four, The *Cloud*, the *Sea*, *Manna*, and the *Rock*. For the cloud we have the history of it, *Exod.* 13. 21, 22. *And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a Cloud, to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day and night. He took not away the pillar of the cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night, from before the people.* As also, *Exod.* 14. 19, 20. *And the Angel from God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them: and the pillar of the Cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them. And it came between the Camp of the Egyptians and the Camp of Israel, and it was a Cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these. So that the one came not near the other all the night.* Which is further enlarged in other texts of Scripture, *Numb.* 9. 15, &c. *Numb.* 14. 14. *Deut.* 1. 33. with observations upon it, *Neh.* 9. 19. *Psal.* 98. 14. concerning which many questions are multiplyed, of which some are not so needful to be answered. 1. For the *number*, whether there was one onely Cloud or two? The text quoted, *Exod.* 13. 21. seems

Exod. 13: 21, 22. opened.

Whether there were two clouds or onely one?

seems to imply that there were two Clouds; one dark, and the other bright, but the other text, *Exod.* 14. 20. as also, *Numb.* 9. 21. rather makes it to be onely one, dark on the one part, and bright on the other, which seems more probable. The first being fitly understood of the various appearances of one and the same Cloud, and not a variety of Clouds. 2. For the *nature* of it, or matter whereof it did consist, which doubtlesse was Supernatural, and extraordinary. Had it been of the common nature of Clouds, which is a thick moist exhalation drawn up by the heat of the Sun, it could not have been of so many years durance, neither could it have subsisted at all elsewhere, then in the middle region of the air. The reflex from the earth would soon have dissolved it. 3. For the *Motion* of it, It is plain that it followed not the motion of the heavens, so it could not at any time have stood still; neither was it carried at all uncertainty with the blasts of winds as ordinary Clouds are, but the motion was ordered according to the good pleasure of God, by the Ministery of an Angell, *Exod.* 14. 9. 4. For the *Forme* of it, it was in appearance as a pillar. The smoke which in a calm season ascends out of Chimneys, sets out the shape of it, being called pillars of smoke, *Cant.* 3. 6. of no greater breadth then the tabernacle, as appears, *Numb.* 9. 15. Had it been of any greater breadth, it had hindred the *Israelites* prospect; and had it not been of eminent height, it could not have been visible for the guidance of *Israel* in that distance in which many of them were often from it. The *Use* is that which is most considerable and that was twofold. 1. As *Israels guide*, as, *Numb.* 9. is fully held forth. When the Cloud stood still, they were to keep in their quarters, and when that moved they were to march, and to march that way that it led. This was the constant use of it, as the Psalmist, *Psal.* 98. 14. observes, and also the Levites on their day of *Israels* humiliation, *Neh.* 9. 19. 2. As *Israels guard*, Exod. 14. 19, 20. It used to be in the van, now it was placed in the reare. It had formerly gone before them as a guide, but now it stood behind them as a guard; so that *Egypt* eagerly set upon the pursuit of them could not come near them. Of this the Psalmist takes notice, *Psal.* 150. 39. *He spread a Cloud for a covering, and a fire to give them light by night*; so that here God was a Sun and shield.

The Cloud not ordinary, but supernatural.

The motion of it guided by an Angel.

The form of it was in appearance as a pillar.

The use of it. 1. As Israels guide.

2. As Israels guard.

The second observable providence is, *Israels passage through*

the Sea, which we find, *Exod.* 14.21,22. *And Moſes ſtretched out his hand over the ſea, and the Lord cauſed the ſea to go back by a ſtrong East-wind all that night, and made the ſea dry land, and the waters were divided. And the children of Iſrael went into the mideſt of the ſea upon the dry ground, and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left.* With frequent Scripture-obſervations upon it, *Joſh.* 4.23. *Pſal.* 78.13. *Pſal.* 114.3. *Heb.* 11.29. In *Moſes* words we ſee; Firſt, *The Author* of this great work, and this is twofold; 1. Principal, the Lord. 2. Secondary, *Moſes* ſtretching out his hand upon the ſign given. Secondly, *The inſtrument*, a ſtrong East wind imployed of God to force the waters againſt their natural current. In which we ſee, 1. *The continuance* a whole night. 2. *The effect* that it wrought, to divide the waters, and to make the land dry; God will keep up his agents untill his work be done. 3. *Iſraels paſſage*, They went into the midſt of the ſea upon the dry ground. 4. *Their ſecurity*, The waters were a wall unto them on the right hand, and on the left. Some have thought, that there were ſeveral diviſions of the ſea into parts, according to the ſeveral tribes of *Iſrael*, but this is without ground; all that we can collect is, that the whole of *Iſrael*, and of thoſe that joyned themſelves to them had a ſafe paſſage made them; they all went out, both old and young, ſons and daughters, *Exod.* 10. 9. and all theſe had a paſſage cut to their hand.

Exod. 14. 21, 22. opened.

Several things obſervable in *Iſraels* paſſage through the Sea.

The third remarkable providence is *Manna*, The narrative of it we may ſee, *Exod.* 16.14,15. *And when the dew that lay was gone up, behold, upon the face of the wilderneſſe there lay a ſmall round thing, as ſmall as the hoar-froſt on the ground. And when the children of* Iſrael *ſaw it, they ſaid one to another, It is Manna; for they wiſt not what it was. And* Moſes *ſaid unto them, This is the bread that the Lord hath given you to eat*, and mentioned in ſeveral other Scriptures, *Num.* 11 7. *Pſal.* 78.24. *Deut.* 8.3. *Nehem.* 9.20. *Joh.* 6.31,49,58. Several remarkable occurrences might be obſerved about it, which is not needful to ſtand upon. It had the name from the *Iſraelites* queſtion upon the ſight of it, not knowing it they ſaid *Manhu*, which is, *what is this?* It was given to *Iſrael* upon their complaint againſt *Moſes* and *Aaron*, that they had brought them forth out of the land of *Egypt* to kill them with hunger, *Exod.* 16.3,4. And it continued with them

Exod. 16. 14, 15. opened.

From whence Manna hath its name.

The time that it did continue with *Israel.*

It was miraculously provided.

A fable concerning it rejected.

them till they came into the Land of *Canaan*, and had eaten of the old Corn of the Land, *Josh.* 5.12. Whether it were of the same kind, with that which at this day in several Countries is found, is much disputed; but whether it were the same, or in nature differing from it, it was certainly miraculously provided to their hands, otherwise it would have been found in that wilderness, both before and after those fourty years of *Israels* travels through it. It was called by the name of *Angels food*, *Psal.*78.23. Not that the Angles feed upon it, but by reason of the excellency of it, as the tongue of him that excells is called the tongue of Angels, 1 *Cor.*13.1. Though that which some talke of the rarity of it, and would gather out of the Wisdom of *Solomon*, Chap.16.20,21. that it was fitted to every mans taste, and as any did fancy, so it was. If any did desire to eat of an Egg, that was turned into an Egg, or to eat of an Hen, or Lamb, that was forthwith turned into such a dish, (and so was a figure of transubstantiation) may well be reckoned amongst the Legend-tales. Then the *Israelites* would never have complained that their soul loathed that light bread, *Num.* 21.5. Nor had they had cause to have said, as they did, *Num.* 11.4,5,6. *Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely: the Cucumbers, and the Melons, and the Leekes, and the Onions, and the Garlick; but now our soul is dryed away; there is nothing at all, besides this Manna before our eyes.* They might (according to this fancy) have found flesh, fish, cucumbers, melons, leekes, onions, garlick, and all things else in the Manna it self, unless any will turn it into an Allegory, that that which answers to all is found in Christ whom Manna did typifie.

Num.20.9. opened.

The last of these providences is the *Rock*. The history we may see, *Exod.*17. *Num.*20.9. and observations made upon it by the Psalmist, *Psal.* 78.15. *Psal.*105.41. *Psal.*114.7,8. and the like by the Levites, *Nehem.*9.25. As the Manna was given upon *Israels* want of bread, so this upon their complaint of want of water. *Go on before the people,* (saith the Lord) *and take with thee of the Elders of* Israel, *and thy rod wherewith thou smotest the river, take in thine hand and go. Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in* Horeb, *and thou shalt smite the Rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink.* How it is said to follow the *Israelites*, 1 *Cor.*10.4. is the great difficulty;

How the rock is said to follow *Israel.*

Rocks

Rocks being above all other things immovable: The Jewiſh fable that it was carried thoſe fourty years on Chariots in the wilderneſſe is not worthy to be named, in order to our inquiry into it. This muſt be taken for granted, that the Rock it ſelf is not here intended as a ſign, but the water flowing out of the rock; As the cup is not the blood of Chriſt in the New Teſtament, but the fruit of the vine that is in it, and this of following the *Iſraelites* being referred to the water which flowed out of the rock. That reſolution which is generally received, is moſt probable, that many running ſtreames, were framed to draw the water along, according to their ſeveral ſtations, and removals, to which *Rives* wil have that ſong, *Num.* 21.17,18. to allude, *Spring up O well, ſing ye to it; The Princes digged the well, Nobles of the people digged it by the direction of the Law-giver with their ſtaves.* But if we referre it to Chriſt, the thing ſignified as *Diodate* on the words ſayes, *it is very properly ſpoken;* for *not onely his benefits are perpetual, but he himſelf who is the ſpring of them, is ever ſeparated from his, but reſideth alwayes in and with them by his Spirit.* If now we look upon theſe reſpective ſigns with our Saviours, and St. *Pauls* Comment upon them, we ſhall not find for the time that they were in uſe, any thing that ſerves to make up the proper nature of Sacraments that was wanting in them. And the Apoſtles hope at which, it appears, he aimes when he ſpeaks of theſe, 1 *Cor.* 10.1,2,3. plainly doth evince it. The *Corinthians* taking themſelves to be high in the favour of God, by reaſon of their priviledge of Baptiſme, and the Supper of the Lord, the Apoſtle lets them know that the Jewes had that which anſwers to our Baptiſme; figuring out ſalvation by Chriſt to them, as Baptiſme to us: They were all baptized unto *Moſes* in the Cloud, and in the Sea. As the deliverance of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt* was a figure of their redemption by Chriſt; and their pilgrimage through the wilderneſſe, an image of the Elects life in the world; and the Land of *Caanan*, a ſhadow of that Kingdom of heaven: ſo their paſſage through the Red-Sea, and their being under the Cloud, were a ſacred figure, correſpondent to Baptiſme; And Manna, and the water coming out of the rock, a ſign which had its relation to the Lords Supper. And our Saviour applyes that type of Manna to himſelf, as we ſee, *Joh.* 6. throughout. When the Jewes ſaid, v. 31. *Our Fathers did eat Manna in the wilderneſſe*, quoting the Pſalmiſts words;

All that is eſſential in Sacraments was found in theſe providences during the time that they ſerved the *Iſraelites*.

words; *He gave them bread to eat*: Christ answers, *Verily, verily I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.* And upon their request, *Lord, evermore give us of this bread*, v. 34. he answers, v. 35. *I am the bread of life, he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.* So also, v. 49,50, and 51. *Your fathers did eat Manna in the wilderness and are dead; This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not dye. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.* Here is an outward visible sign given of God, and received of his Covenant-people, sealing Christ, or righteousnesse by Christ unto them. The whole therefore that is of the essence of a Sacrament is found in them. Onely these were found with *Israel*, but for a time, namely, the time of the pilgrimage in the wilderness, when Circumcision, and the Passeover, Baptisme and the Lords Supper are Ordinances, stated and constant; therefore the observation is, that in Old-Testament-times there were onely two standing Ordinances, of the nature of Sacraments.

Here some questions might be put necessary to be answered.

Object. 1. 1. Though we have the word [Baptisme] in this text of Scripture, yet the addition seems to make it no Sacrament; *They were baptized into Moses*, saith the text, and being baptized into *Moses*, how could it be the same with Christian Baptisme? We are baptized into Christ, and not into *Moses*.

Answ. *Ans. Into Moses*, is here no more, then the Ministery of *Moses*, or by the hand of *Moses*, who was a Mediatour in type, between God and that people. And though some would overthrow our argument drawn from Baptisme into the Name of the Son, and holy Ghost, as into the Name of the Father, to prove that the Son, and the holy Ghost are God, as is the Father, seeing we are baptized (as they object) into *Moses*; yet *Moses* is not God; It will not yet serve their turn, seeing the Name of the Son, and of the holy Ghost are made equall in Baptisme, to the Name of the Father, and so is not the name of *Moses*. We are Baptized into the Name of Christ, and called by his Name; so the

Israelites

Israelites never were into the name of *Moses* no more then the *Corinthians* into the name of *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. That is Christs peculiar with the Father, and the holy Ghost, not communicated to any creature.

2. It is objected, that these outward elements were given not onely to the *Israelites*, but also to their beasts; for the water of the rock, the text saies, *They drank of it and their cattel*, Num 20. 11. And as for Manna, *Bellarmine* contends that there can be no question, but the Domestick creatures, as Dogs, and Hens did eat of it; that not by casualty, or wickednesse, (as he confesseth they may of the Eucharist, and so a Dog or a Swine eats Christ) but ordinarily or commonly. *Object.* 2.

Answ. We must distinguish between the Natural and Mystical use of this Manna, and of this water. The natural use was for their bodies, as well men, as beasts; and of all such beasts as they had in their possession. The Mystical use, was as pledges of Spiritual mercies and favours. *Answ.* 1.

2. The whole of those elements were not Sacramental, but the eating and drinking of men in Covenant, is necessary to make them Sacraments. Participation is a part, (as I may say) of consecration. The bread and wine is not unto us the body and blood of Christ, unlesse it be eaten and drunk; neither was this Spiritual meat, or Spiritual drink before the *Israelites* ate and drank of it. 2.

3. It is objected, that the *Israelites* saw no such thing as Baptisme in the Cloud, or in the Sea: nor any such thing as remission of sin, which is the fruit of Baptisme: nor any such Spiritual nourishment in Manna, or the Rock. They saw the Cloud to be their present safety, and Manna and the Rock their sustenance. *Object.* 3.

Answ. 1. What *Israel* did see is one thing, and what these did hold forth to be seen is another. *Answ.* 1.

2. That they saw not Christ in these Sacraments; nor yet in Circumcision in that explicite cleare way, as we see him in Baptisme or the Lords Supper, is evident: but they saw these to be evidences, and signes of God in Covenant with them, and that as they were hereby kept from the present, that so he would keep them from everlasting danger. They saw Christ implicitely, though not explicitely in these Ordinances, and so for the time of their continuance 2.

ance, they had the nature, and were of the uſe of Sacraments.

SECT. V.

The five ſuppoſititious Sacraments of Rome Examined.

IN the next place we are to make it appear that there are in New-Teſtament-times, onely two Sacraments, Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper. In this we may be more cleare, ſeeing none is ſet up in competition with any fair colour. And here the five ſuppoſitious Sacraments of the Church of *Rome* offer themſelves; which are either ſuch which (according to them) belong to all in general, or thoſe that are reſtrained to ſome in peculiar. Of the former ſort there are three, *Confirmation*, *Penance*, and *Extreame Unction*. Of the latter two, *Orders*, and *Marriage*.

SECT. VI.

Confirmation no Sacrament.

THe firſt of theſe is *Confirmation*. For diſcovery of which we muſt leave the fountain of Scriptures, to rake in the dunghill of Popiſh Writers. In caſe therefore we ſhould dwell too long in it, the Reader would be in danger to nauſeate it; yet perhaps it may not be ungrateful to look into it, to ſee the mercy of our deliverance from it. Though they put it after Baptiſme in order, yet with them it goes before it in honour. In Baptiſme we are made the ſervants of Chriſt: in Confirmation they become his Champions or Souldiers; Confirmation therefore perfects what Baptiſme begins: and before confirmation, baptized ones are onely one half Chriſtians; The loweſt Prieſt may therefore ordinarily baptize, and any other upon emergent neceſſity: but the Biſhop onely may confirm. Concerning this the Councel of

Confirmation preferred before Baptiſme.

Trent

Trent hath determined: *If any ſhall ſay, that confirmation of baptized ones, is an idle Ceremony, and not rather a true and proper Sacrament, or that heretofore it was nothing but a certain Catechiſme in which young perſons of growth, gave a reaſon of their faith before the Church, let him be accurſed.* And now it is time for all that have ſworn to that Councel to ſee that they defend it. I ſhall briefly out of *Bellarmine* lay down the whole of it. The *matter* of it he laies down in four propoſitions. 1. *Chriſme or Unction is the matter of Confirmation.* 2. *The matter of Confirmation is not ſimple oil, but oil mixt with balſame.* 3. *Chriſme which is the matter of confirmation is firſt to be conſecrated and bleſt.* 4. *The ointment of Chriſme ought to be made in the form of a croſſe in the forehead of the baptized perſon, that it may be the true and immediate matter of this Sacrament.* The *form* of this Sacrament is this, *I ſign thee with the ſign of the croſſe, and confirm thee with the Chriſme of ſalvation in the Name of*, &c. The fruit of it is, 1. *To conferre grace, to ſtrengthen the ſoul againſt Satans aſſaults.* 2. *To conferre an indelible character whereby men are received into the Army of Chriſt, as in Baptiſme they are received into his family*; ſo that it may not be reiterated any more then Baptiſme. The *Miniſter* of this Sacrament is onely the Biſhop, and no other; He that adminiſters other Sacraments, hath nothing to do with this Sacrament. The Ceremonies are twofold. 1. At conſecration. 2. At adminiſtration. At conſecration there are four Ceremonies. The Oyl and Balſame are bleſſed with prayer, with the ſign of the Croſſe. The Biſhop breaths certain times on the ointment, he ſalutes it with theſe words. *All hail holy Chriſme.* At the adminiſtration there are eight Ceremonies. There muſt be a Godfather preſent, prayers muſt be uſed over them, the Biſhop gives a *pax* to the party now confirmed, he gives him a blow upon the face, the forehead muſt be bound with a fillet, ſome ſay ſeven daies, others onely three. The head muſt not be waſhed, nor the forehead for ſeven daies ſpace. It muſt be adminiſtred at the feaſt of Pentecoſt. Laſtly, it muſt be done with faſting. When all this is conſidered we may well think that *Auſtin* was much deceived, when he ſaid that the Sacraments of the New Teſtament are few and eaſy. *Bellarmine* in order to prove this to be a Sacrament, laies down three requiſites in a Sacrament. 1. A promiſe of grace. 2. An outward ſenſible ſign as an organ or inſtrument to convey the

The matter of confirmation.

The form. The fruit.

The Miniſter.

The Ceremonies. At Conſecration.

At the adminiſtration.

the promiſe. 3. A command of God for adminiſtration. But all of theſe we ſay are wanting in this Suppoſed Sacrament, and therefore according to himſelf it is no Sacrament. The promiſe of grace he thinks he finds in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and ſixteenth Chapters of S^t. *John*'s Goſpel: where the Holy Ghoſt is promiſed to the Apoſtles, to make them valiant and undaunted in the profeſſion of the faith. And, *Luk.* 24. where they are commanded to tarry at *Jeruſalem* until they be endued with power from on high. And, *Act.* 1. where they are promiſed to receive power after that the Holy Ghoſt is come upon them. Here if our Author may be heard, is enough. A divine promiſe, and that in Scripture, made to men baptized, for a larger meaſure of grace, for ſtrength, for confeſſion of faith. But our acute diſputant ſhould ſhew us where this promiſe is made to his Chriſme made up of oyl and Balſame. and thus croſs'd and bleſs'd. 2. He ſhould remember that he himſelf tells us, that the Apoſtles had this promiſe made good unto them without this or any ſign at all. 3. He might have found many of theſe promiſes in Old-Teſtament times, which yet made up no ſuch Sacrament in thoſe daies. The outward ſenſible ſign he finds, *Act.* 8. where it is ſaid, *They put their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghoſt.* But, 1. Papiſts uſe no impoſition of hands in this ſuppoſed Sacrament. 2. In other Sacraments, both we and they make the outward ſign and matter, to be one and the ſame; why is it then that impoſition of hands is the ſign, and other things the matter? 3. The gifts there mentioned are not ſaving, but miraculous, proper to thoſe times, and not found in ours. 4. Thoſe were conferred before Baptiſme as well as after, *Act.* 10. 44. *Who can forbid water that theſe ſhould be baptized, ſeeing they have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* The command from God *Bellarmine* will prove from the Apoſtles uſe of this ſign; *If God had not enjoyned impoſition of hands, they would not ſo ordinarily* (ſaith he) *have laid on their hands in conferring of gifts.* Anſw. 1. we look for a command for that which our adverſaries do uſe, *viz.* their Chriſme, Balſame, Croſſe, and not for impoſition of hands, which they uſe not. 2. *John* did baptize, yet our Author will not allow that for a proof that he had a command to baptize. 3. The pen-men of the Holy Ghoſt wrote Scripture, yet that is no proof with him, that they had a command to write 4. *Alex. Hal.* part. 4 quæſt. 9. affirms that Chriſt the Lord did

Joh. 14. 15. 16. chap. Luk. 24. Act. 1. vindicated.

Act. 8. 17. vindicated.

The Apoſtles impoſition of hands no proof of Confirmation.

did neither institute nor dispense this Sacrament as it is a Sacrament. 5. *Thomas Aquinas* is more modest likewise, as we heard before when we spake to the Author of Sacraments, confessing that their Chrisme is not found in Scriptures, and he excuses it as not belonging to the being but solemnity of Sacraments, therein confessing that all that belongs to the being of Sacraments ought to be written in Scriptures. But though his answer is more modest, yet it is lesse advised; that which all his fellowes make the matter of this Sacrament, he denies to belong to the being of it.

The ancient use of that which afterwards did degenerate into this foppery, *Bellarmine* out of *Chemnitius* layes down in six Propositions. 1. *When a child baptized in infancy comes to discretion, he is to be instructed in the principles of Religion, and then to be brought before the Church, and put in mind of his Baptisme, how and why he was baptized.* 2. *He is to utter a profession of his own faith according as he hath learned.* 3. *He is to be examined in the principal heads of Christian Religion.* 4. *He is to be admonished that hereby he now differs from Heathens, Heretick, and all of prophane opinions.* 5. *There is to be added an exhortation concerning the vow of Baptisme, and the necessity of perseverance in the doctrine.* 6. *This is to be concluded with prayer.* And if laying on of hands be used, it may be well done, saith *Chemnitius*, without any superstition. But when care in Catechizing, and examination is wanting, it is no better (saith he) then an idle Ceremony, and with addition of the forementioned Ceremonies a meer foppery.

The ancient use of confirmation degenerated into this practice.

SECT. VII.

Pennance no Sacrament.

THe next that they would obtrude upon us as a Sacrament is *Pennance*; Satan not enduring the grace of Repentance, hath made it his businesse to rob us of the Word, and to bring in that of Pennance in the stead of it, leaving little that is of God in it, and making it up with the device of man. It is not

my work in this place to ſpeak to Repentance, as it is held forth in the Goſpel to us, and to be practiſed of Chriſtians, whether as it is inward, the change of the mind and will from evil to good, from Satan to God; or outward, in anſwerable works of obedience. We confeſſe a neceſſity of it in this ſenſe, in the higheſt degree, a neceſſity as well *medii*, as *præcepti*, being not onely enjoyned by command from God, but of that neceſſity that ſalvation cannot be obtained without it, *Luk.* 13. 3. *Except ye repent, ye ſhall all likewiſe periſh*; but the Sacramentality of it, which they aſſert, we wholly deny. Our ſouls having all made ſhipwrack in our firſt parents, and upon that account made lyable to wrath, the firſt plank for ſafety they ſay is Baptiſme; in which all ſin, Original, or Actual, before contracted is actually pardoned; and that Sacrament is (as they ſay) of no further uſe, for the pardon of any ſins following after it. The ſecond plank for ſafety after ſhipwrack with them is Pennance, which is a following Sacrament for remiſſion of ſins, not ſo eaſie as the former; but attended with more trouble, conſiſting of three parts, *Contrition*, *Confeſſion*, and *Satisfaction*. The firſt of theſe aright underſtood, we willingly acknowledge to be a Chriſtian duty, and a neceſſary requiſite to the grace of Repentance, 2 *Cor.* 7. 10. *Godly ſorrow worketh Repentance to Salvation not to be repented of.* Upon ſenſe of ſin, we are brought to turn from ſin. Confeſſion we likewiſe acknowledge, knowing with *Job*, that it is an evil to hide our ſins as *Adam*, *Job* 31. 33. and that the Apoſtle tells us, *If we confeſſe our ſins, God is juſt and faithful to forgive us our ſins, and cleanſe us from all unrighteouſneſſe*, 1 Joh. 1. 10. But that which they would bring in, which is a whiſper of all in a Prieſts ear, in order to take from him ſome bodily Pennance, and accordingly receive his abſolution, we deny, and well know that it were a vain labour to ſearch into the Scriptures, or antiquity for it. Satisfaction we ſo farre receive, that offenders to publick ſcandal, muſt make that publick acknowledgement, that the Church may with freedom receive them into communion. But for ſatisfaction to God, we muſt let it alone for ever, unleſſe we will ſhoulder Chriſt out of that function, and take it upon our own perſons; he will never ſuffer that we ſhould be ſharers with him in it, and ſo we ſhould be for ever on the work (as the damned in hell are) and never able to go through with it. This is, as though

The parts of pennance.

1. Contrition.

2. Confeſſion.

3. Satisfaction.

a man were fined of his Prince, as much as the ſervant in the Parable was indebted to his Lord, ten thouſand talents, and ſhould attempt to pay it with a few pence of a counterfeit coyn of his own ſtamp, making good a leſſer crime with high treaſon. And whileſt theſe add all this of their own, they leave out the very whole of that, which according to Scripture is eſſential to repentance, which is a thorough change, and amendment of our wayes. And how they got it into their heads to thruſt it among Sacraments, a man might think of it, even to amazement. And they themſelves are ſo confounded about it, that they know not how to find any thing of a Sacrament in it. *Bellarmine* ſayes, that they affirm with great conſent; that Pennance is a Sacrament but confeſſes, that there is difference among them, to aſſign what in Pennance is the Sacrament; here then ſure is a glorious agreement. And it were eaſie to multiply arguments againſt it. 1. There is no outward viſible ſign appointed of God in this Pennance of theirs, with any promiſe annext, which even adverſaries confeſſe is of neceſſity to the being of Sacraments. *Bellarmine* (who makes every thing to be viſible that is any way ſenſible) ſayes, That both confeſſion, and abſolution, is a viſible ſign in Pennance; ſo that the words of the Pennance-taker, and Pennance-doer concurre together to make a viſible ſign, and this ſign in that way viſible, as he can make it, he onely affirms, but never proves to have any Divine inſtitution. And his brethren, *Scotus*, *Major*, *Gabriel*, *Dionyſ. Ciſterſienſis*, deny that confeſſion is any part of Pennance, as *Ameſius* obſerves; and *Soto* denyes, that abſolution is any part of it. 2. Repentance was in uſe in the Church, and of equal efficacy as now, when yet by their own confeſſion it was no Sacrament, *viz.* in the time of the Law, in the time of *John Baptiſt*, and of our Saviour Chriſt; and therefore now it is no more a Sacrament then it was then. 3. Baptiſme is of the ſame uſe, and ſerves for the ſame purpoſe, as that which they imagine to find in their Pennance, and engages to Goſpel-Repentance for remiſſion of ſins. And this is an undoubted confeſſed Sacrament, and there needs not therefore any fiction of a ſecond. And the Reader may find this ſo at large diſputed in *Chamier*, *Vorſtius*, *Ameſius*, that I ſhall ceaſe to add any more concerning it.

Papiſts agree not what that is in pennance that makes up a Sacrament.

Arguments evincing pennance to be no Sacrament.

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

Extream unction no Sacrament

THe third which they obtrude, is *Extream Unction*: A rite which they adminiſter upon mens departure out of this life, as a *viaticum* to carry them hence. And *Bellarmine* undertaking to make it good by reaſon, ſaith, *It is meet that men ſhould have ſupport by divine providence in their departure out of the Church, as they have in their entrance into it.* As they are ſaluted with a Sacrament, ſo he would have one for their farewel likewiſe. It is then wonder that the Jews had not one to anſwer Circumciſion, as they have novv found out one to anſvver Baptiſme. Providence it ſeems vvas then vvanting in that vvhich the Jeſuite thinks meet ſhould then have been provided. The *matter* of this Sacrament is, *oyl olive bleſt by the Biſhop.* The *form* is in theſe words, *By this holy oyntment and his moſt tender mercy God forgive thee whatſoever thou haſt offended by ſight, &c.* The *effect* of it is, firſt, *the healing of the body if it be found good for the ſoul*; though they never apply it, till this be deſperate. Secondly, *the taking away of the remainders of ſin*; but what ſin, they cannot determine. The *Miniſter* of it is a Prieſt, conſequently a Biſhop, if he pleaſe. For the ſubject capable of it, ſix qualifications are required: 1. *He muſt be a Chriſtian.* 2. *A weak one.* 3. *One dangerouſly ſick and weak.* 4. *One of years, with the uſe of reaſon.* 5. *One not excommunicated.* 6. *One that hath taken confeſſion and abſolution, if he be found guilty of ſin.* Ceremonies uſed in this Sacrament are two: 1. *The Letany and certain other prayers muſt be repeated.* 2. *Seven parts of his body muſt be anointed,* viz. *eyes, ears, noſe, mouth, hands, by reaſon of the five ſenſes, and the reins where is the ſeat of concupiſcence, and the feet upon account of the loco-motive faculty.* But whether all of this be eſſential, they are loath to determine. They have two onely Texts which they offer to produce to eſtabliſh this Sacrament. The firſt is, *Mark* 6. 13. *And they caſt out many devils, and anointed with oyl many that were ſick, and healed them.* This *Bellarmine* denyes to hold out any Sacrament, and ſee alſo *Janſenius* upon the words, likewiſe *Ruardus, Soto,* as *Bellarmine* tells us. *Bellarmine*

The matter. The form.

The effects.

The Miniſter.

Qualifications of the perſon capable of extream unction. Ceremonies.

Mar. 6. 13. vindicated.

mine is induced to this opinion, as he ſayes, becauſe *Luther, Calvin,* and *Chemnitius* hold, that the ointment, *Jam.* 5. & *Mark* 6. are both the ſame. And he will make an hard adventure towards the loſſe of a Sacrament, rather then he will joyn ſo far with ſuch hereticks in opinion. And this Text alſo together with that of *James* 5. 13. is rejected by *Cajetan*, as he is quoted by *Chamier and Ameſius*. *It doth not appear* (ſaith he) *either from the words, or from the effect that theſe words ſpeak of the Sacramental anointing of extream unction, but rather of that oyntment which the Lord Jeſus inſtituted in the Goſpel to be applyed by his diſciples to the ſick; For the Text doth not ſay, Is any ſick to death? but abſolutely is any ſick? And the effect is the raiſing up of the ſick: And it ſpeaks of forgiveneſſe of ſins no otherwiſe then conditionally, when extream unction is not given but even at the point of death. And as the form of it ſpeaks, it tends directly to the pardon of ſin. Beſides, James commands that many Elders be ſent for to one ſick perſon, and many for prayer, which is not done in extream Unction.* So that when there are but two texts pretended for this Sacrament, one Cardinal hath robb'd them of one, and another of both. Againſt the Sacramentality of this oyl we have theſe arguments. 1. Sacraments are for all the covenant-people of God in general, without reſpect had to this or that condition, and this is for the ſick onely. 2. Sacraments are ſigns and ſeals of ſpiritual grace, this is a ſign onely of recovery from ſickneſſe, being appointed for the ſick to raiſe them up. And whereas it is objected that pardon of ſinne is here mentioned; it is plain that it is onely mentioned in order to the cure of the bodily infirmity, and to be obtained by prayer, not wrought by the oyl. The pardon of ſuch ſinne that may have brought upon the patient any ſuch ſickneſſe, as, 2 *Chron.* 7. 14. When the Land is under famine or peſtilence, there the Lord ſaies, *If my people that are called by my Name, do humble themſelves, and pray, and ſeek my face, and turn from their wicked waies, then I will hear in heaven, and pardon their ſin, and heal the land.* The pardon of the Lands ſinne is there in order to the removal of the Lands judgement. The pardon of the ſinne of the ſick patient, is here for his healing likewiſe. Much more might be ſpoke againſt our adverſaries uſe of it. They limit it to Oyl olive, when Scripture ſpeaks of Oyl in general. They muſt have the Biſhops bleſſing upon it, when Scripture hath no ſuch thing; And in Scripture he that

Jam. 5. 14, 15. vindicated.

that adminiſters a Sacrament, is ſufficient for the bleſſing of it. No one word of their form is found in the Scripture. They never intend recovery when that yet is the whole of Scripture-intention. For a right underſtanding of this text in *James*, about which moſt of the controverſy lyes, it is not ſo eaſy to determine. It ſtands much upon matter of fact, and we are at too great a diſtance, for any clear diſcovery. It is ordinarily underſtood of a Miraculous power, as that other text, *Mark* 6. 13. muſt be underſtood. And the miraculous gift ceaſing, the rite (ſay Divines) would ſoon appear ridiculous; and that it doth ceaſe, we need no more for proof then our own experience; and in caſe it had conſtantly held, it would have been look't upon as ordinary, and not miraculous. But I ingenuouſly confeſſe, I ſee more difficulties attending this interpretation, then I know well how to ſalve. 1. I ſee not in any age of the Church, any rule given to all that were ſick, to look after a miraculous way of healing; but that they made uſe of it as providence extraordinarily did offer the opportunity. 2. Had they had direction from God to ſeek for a miraculous cure, it ſhould ſtill have anſwered their expectation, when yet that is denied on all hands. And whereas it is ſaid, that they that had this power, had alſo with it a ſpirit of diſcerning to whom to apply it; why ſhould then the command be given to all promiſcuouſly to enquire after it? 3. Miraculous gifts were for healing of deaf, dumb, blind, as well as ſick perſons; (as *Bellarmine* not impertinently obſerves) why then are onely the ſick here mentioned? 4. It ſeems to imply that all Elders of the Church had this gift of healing, which is contrary to that text, 1 *Cor.* 12. 29, 30. Others underſtand it of a medicinal power in the oyl, but all Elders were not Phyſicians, and one oyl would not cure all diſeaſes. Some ſpeak of it as an hieroglyphick or outward Symbol which was in uſe amongſt the Jevves, to hold out any thing that is ſpiritual; but it is very doubtful, vvhether the Apoſtle vvould permit, much leſſe can I think that he would preſcribe the uſe of theſe to Chriſtians. I moſt readily therefore ſubſcribe to that of *Ameſius*, which I confeſſe gave me great content when I found it in him, that ſo I might not be ſaid to be alone in the opinion [a] *This oyl (ſaith he) may be taken Synechdochically for any healing medicine whatſoever*; And anſwering *Bellarmines* objection, why direction

Jam. 5. 14, 15. opened.

[a] Oleum poteſt Synechdochice poni pro medicamento ſalutari,

on is here given onely to the ſick, and not to the blind, &c. he ſaies, [b] *that it is given onely to them, becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks not of the miraculous uſe of oyl onely, but the way to deal with ſick perſons.* So that miracles where the gift was, are not excluded, but all means, whether ordinary or extraordinary, according to the Apoſtles preſcript, are to be applyed. *The Elders are to be ſent for* (ſaith he) *eſpecially for prayer and conſolation; but ſo that the uſe of means upon that pretence be not neglected,* ſo that it is little other, than that which Chriſt gave in charge concerning the damſel that he had raiſed to liſe, that ſomething ſhould be given her to eat, *Mark.* 5. 43. Some, as is ſaid, have made an eſſay to revive this cuſtome in theſe times, and in their viſit of the ſick, will follow the Apoſtle in the letter, they will pray, and praying will anoint with oil likewiſe. I would that theſe would give ſome diſtinct account of their proceedings. 1. Whereas there are in the world ſo many ſorts of oyl, even beyond number, whether any that is called oyl will ſerve the turn? Trayn-oyl (which yet in moſt places is readieſt) would ſure be thought too groſſe to be imployed in it. 2. To what part of the Patient they do apply it; and in what quantity? In our colder clinates, and eſpecially in colder ſeaſons, in ſtead of helping perhaps this liquid ſtuffe may ſoon wrong weak perſons. 3. What effect they expect from it; whether corporeal, or ſpiritual, or a mixture of both? 4. Whether they uſe it as an inſtrument, to work that which they expect upon application of it, or onely a ſymbol for aſſurance that God will work? If they make uſe of it as an inſtrument, it muſt either be for conferring of ſpiritual grace vvhich (as vve have heard) is denyed to Sacramental ſignes, or elſe for the obtaining of bodily health; then they muſt ſee that it be φάρμακον καθόλικον, othervviſe they are in danger not onely to uſe it in vain, but for harm. If they make uſe of it as a ſymbol or ſign to aſſure that God will work, then let them firſt produce a promiſe: there the effect is attributed not to the oyl, but to the prayer of faith; and ſecondly, let them acquaint us how to diſcern thoſe unto whom we may with ſucceſſe apply it, otherwiſe we ſhall not onely loſe our oyl and our labour, but expoſe it unto ſcorn likewiſe. And it cannot be expected that all ſhould be thus healed.

[b] Conſilium datur tantum de ægrotis, quia non de miraculoſo uſu olei in genere, ſed de ægrotorum directione tractatur.

SECT. IX.

Orders are no Sacrament.

THe fourth which they would obtrude upon as is *Orders*, or the ſolemn way of the call of Miniſters to their functions. This, or rather theſe; they will have to be a Sacrament properly ſo called. And theſe Orders are divided into ſeven, and one of the ſeven is ſubdivided inco two ſo that this one Sacrament if it hit right, hath gained ſeven more, and ſo they have fourteen Sacraments. The firſt of theſe is, the office of *Prieſthood*, which they ſubdivide into two; *Biſhops*, and *Presbyters*, which as they ſay, differ in order, and not in degree onely, as a Biſhop, and an Arch-Biſhop; and therefore muſt have diſtinct Ordinations. The next is of *Deacons*, to aſſiſt the Prieſt in all things which are done in the Sacrament. The third is, *Sub-Deacons*, to bring the Chalice and Patin, the Cruſe with water, and Towell, to the Altar. The fourth is *Door-keepers*, to receive the Keyes. The fifth *Readers*, to read Scriptures in unknown languages. The ſixth *Exorciſts*, to caſt out uncleane ſpirits. The laſt *Acolythes*, to carry Torches or Tapers when the Goſpel is read, or the ſacrifice to be offered. *Bellarmine* tells us that the Ordination of Preſbyters is a Sacrament by the conſent of all, and he himſelf determines, that the Ordination of Biſhops is a Sacrament, and according to him there is no other Scripture-Ordination, ſeeing all the Scriptures that ſpeak of it, ſpeak (as he ſayes) of the Ordinatiou of Biſhops; though he multiplies Authors denying their Ordination to be any Sacrament. Ordination of Deacons, he ſayes, is very probable, and to be believed that it is a Sacrament, though it be no Article of faith to believe it; which he proves, becauſe it cannot be evidently deduced out of the Written Word. or tradition: Neither is there (ſaith he) any determination of the Church for it. For Sub-Deacons, he ſayes there is not that certainty as of Deacons, yet (he ſayes) it is very probable that it is a Sacrament

The number of orders and their diviſions and offices.

Moſt of theſe doubted among themſelves whether they be Sacraments.

crament, though he hath such an argument against it, as that none but himself will be ever able to answer. Imposition of hands, he sayes, (and proves out of the fourth Councel of *Carthage*, Canon 5.) is not used in it, and yet his whole nineth Chapter is spent to prove, that imposition of hands is essential in this Sacrament. It is a Sacrament, save onely that it wants the essentials of a Sacrament, as do indeed all their five supposititious ones. The four last which with them are the lesser Orders, have not, (as he sayes) that probability that they are Sacraments, as that of subdeaconship: yet the opinion that affirmes their Sacramentality, is far more probable then that which denyes it. Their learned Councel are not yet agreed, what is the matter of this, or these Sacraments, whether it be the imposition of hands, or the holding out of such an instrument, as belongs to their function, as a Chalice to the Priest, &c. The words uttered to each respectively, when such an instrument is delivered, are the form. The effect of these is, 1. A Spiritual and perpetual power for discharge of their function, of which the indelible character is a token. 2. Saving grace for a right discharge of their function. The Minister of these is a Bishop, and the Ceremonies, *Anointing*, and *Shaving*. That the Ordination of Ministers for their function is Gospel Ordinance, we willingly grant, and that no man should take upon him this honour, to deal for men in things appertaining to God unlesse he be called, as *Aaron*; *Tymothy* was this way called to the work, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. and he hath a directory given him for the call of others, 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. *Titus* is left in *Crete* for this purpose, *Tit.* 1. 5. and *Paul* and *Barnabas*, in every City where they come, act in it. Yet it is far short of the honour of a Sacrament properly so called. The outward rite of imposition of hands was used, not so much for significancy, as decency, being an usage in religious acts, of solemnity before the Law, under the Law, and continued in Gospel-times, as standing with the simplicity of it; yet we dare not with *Bellarmine*, make it essential to Ordination, finding no institution of it for a sign, much lesse any saving grace annext to it by way of promise; so that here, both an outward instituted sign, and inward grace are wanting. Neither is it such in which all the people of God are interested. One peculiar order onely can claime to it. In the time of the law, this was

The matter of these Sacraments not agreed upon.

The form.

The effect.

The Minister.

Reasons evincing it to be no Sacrament.

in uſe, and yet by their own confeſſion, it was then no Sacrament. And it is very ſtrange, that not onely power given for adminiſtration of Sacraments, ſhould be a Sacrament, but authority to open the door for theſe that come for the Sacrament; as for other Ordinances, ſhould be a Sacrament likewiſe. The greateſt thing that adverſaries talke of is, that *Calvin* in Inſtit. lib. 4. cap. 14. ſect. 20. ſaith, *that he can willingly ſuffer Ordination to be called a Sacrament*; but they are unwilling to take notice that he denyes to number, or reckon it among Ordinary Sacraments, and therefore it is plain, that he takes the word in a more large acceptation then ordinary: which is further clear in that in his Comment on *Jam.* 5. 14. he makes the oyl which Chriſts Diſciples uſed, *Mark* 6. 13. for the time that the uſe of it continued to be a Sacrament, when yet he reſtrains the whole effect or fruit of it to the health of the body onely, which falls far ſhort of his famouſly known definition of a Sacrament; ſo that Ordination neither according to Scripture nor *Calvin* is to be accounted a Sacrament.

Calvin vindicated.

SECT. X.

Marriage no Sacrament.

THe laſt Sacrament which they would obtrude upon us is Marriage, which they have determined to be a Sacrament, as well as the reſt that ſerve to make up the number, whileſt the ſolemnizing of it holds; and the parties are upon the work. The words, or ſignes expreſſing conſent (according to *Bellarmine*) is both *matter* and *form* of this Sacrament: But when the work is over, then the married couple, in their perſons are the matter; and the words or ſignes are the form. The married perſons expreſſing their conſent in any manner whatſoever, are themſelves the Miniſter of this Sacrament. *Canus* ſeeing how great a diſhonour it is to Sacraments, to make that which is acted in the moſt prophane and clandeſtine manner, a Sacrament, reſolves that the words of the perſons, thus expreſſing conſent, are the form of the contract of Marriage, and that upon

Matter.
Form.

Miniſter.

on that account marriage is valid; but it is no Sacrament, according to him, unleſſe it be done by a lawful Miniſter; but this *Bellarmine* oppoſeth as a ſingular and new opinion. A Sacrament then, according to him, is, whereſoever a marriage is, and marriage is, where conſent of Parties is expreſſed; though in the lewdeſt way, by perſons under Parents power, and not at their own diſpoſe, by divine appointment. We willingly yield it to be an Ordinance, eſtabliſhed by God, but very ſhort of the nature or honour of a Sacrament, for divers reaſons: 1. It was the ſame, as it is now, from the beginning; and yet all that ſpace of time from *Adam* to Chriſts coming in the fleſh it was no Sacrament, by our adverſaries confeſſion. 2. It is an Ordinance in common for mankind, and no Ordinance peculiar to the Church; The whole world of mankind have their intereſt in it; and Sacraments are known to be onely Church-priviledges. 3. All the people of God are not tyed to it: ſome have their liberty to abſtain from it; and all Sacraments are under a precept; yea, according to our adverſaries, it is a degree of perfection unto merit in all to keep out of it, and unto meu of ſome orders a defilement. Laſtly, as *Durand* doth obſerve, The whole that is done in it ſpeaks its own uſe and ſignification, and the uſe and ſignification of Sacraments wholly depends upon divine inſtitution. They have nothing that beares any colour to ſay for the Sacramentality of it, ſave that Text of the Apoſtle, *Epheſ.* 5. 32. where the Apoſtle having illuſtrated that love, which is due from the husband to the wife, by that ſimilitude of the love of Chriſt to the Church, concludes, *This is a great Myſtery*: and having ſpoke, both of the union betwixt Chriſt and the Church, and between man and his wife; to prevent all miſtakes, he addes, *but I ſpeak of Chriſt and his Church*; ſo that firſt we have not the word Sacrament there, but the word Myſtery, which by *Bellarmines* own confeſſion is not elſewhere in Scripture to be underſtood of any Sacrament: and *Cajetan* on the words (as *Ameſius* obſerves) warnes the prudent Reader to obſerve, that we have not from *Paul* in this place, that Marriage is any Sacrament. So that neither word nor thing is found in Scripture, that Marriage is a Sacrament. Every one of theſe might have born a large diſcourſe,

Reaſons evincing it to be no Sacrament. *Reaſ.* 1.

2.

3.

4.

courſe, as is well known to all that are verſt in theſe controverſies. But ſo many having ſpoken ſo fully to them, though I was unwilling (intending a Treatiſe of the Sacraments,) wholly to omit them, yet was reſolved, that the Reader might not be overburthened, to be as brief as poſſible in them.

FINIS.

A

POSTSCRIPT

TO

REVEREND and LEARNED

Master *BAXTER*,

IN WHICH,

These following *QUESTIONS* are friendly debated.

Whether faith in Christ, quà Lord, be the justifying act?
Whether mans Evangelicall, personall righteousness, be here perfect?
Whether the Morall Law is a perfect rule of righteousness?
Whether Unbelief, and Impenitence in professed Christians, are violations of the Covenant of Grace?
Whether Faith and Repentance be Gods conditions, or mans, in the proper conditionall Covenant?
Whether the Covenant of Grace require perfection, and accept sincerity?

With an enquiry into the judgement of Antiquity about severall things in reference to Justification.

Sicut meritum Christi non potest apprehendi ad justitiam & salutem, nisi per organon fidei, divinitùs ad hoc ordinatum: ita si fides alibi, quàm in suo proprio & principali objecto, quærat Justificationem, non invenit nec accipit illam.

Chemnit. exam: concil: Trident: de fid: Justif: pag. 159.

LONDON,
Printed by *S. G.* for *Abel Roper*, at the Sign of the *Sun*, against *Dunstans* Church in *Fleet-street*. 1655.

A

POSTSCRIPT

TO

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE INTRODUCTION.

REverend, Beloved, and much Honoured, I have received your Apologie, according to your appointment, from your Stationer, for which I return you hearty thanks, as for the gift it ſelf, ſo for the pains that you have taken to rectifie me, where, in your judgement, I have publickly ſtept aſide. An error in Divine things, if it ſtand alone, without addition of further aggravations, is not light. Truth being of ſuch divine excellency, that no penſil can draw out; all deviation from it into oppoſite error muſt needs anſwer, in black deformity, and darkneſs: But when it is not ſimple error, but joyned with endeavour to engage others, it is far above it ſelf in fowlneſs. To reduce a brother therefore, not onely erring, but thus erring, muſt needs be an high, acceptable office of love. But in this, I need to do no more, than to ſay over to you, what you have ſaid to me, in your firſt and ſecond page, which you ſtile your Prologue. In this (if we both ſpeak our hearts & thoughts) we are one. And I wiſh that in all other things, there were a like unity in judgement, and the time I hope (with ſome confidence) is near at hand, that all miſts and clouds will be ſo diſpelled, that we ſhall arrive at perfect union. And as for infinite other reaſons, ſo for this, glory is infinitely deſireable. In order to a right underſtanding between us, I muſt acquaint you, that your firſt words, after your Chriſtian ſalute, have their miſtake, though not much material; whether upon mi-

ſtake of my words, when I laſt ſaw you in *Shrewsbury*; or fayling in memory, I cannot determine. I told you not, that I had then ſent to the Preſs a treatiſe of the Covenant, but wiſhed you, indeed, not to be offended, in caſe I ſhould in ſuch a treatiſe, publiſh ſomewhat in the way that you mention. In which I do not barely oppoſe my memory to yours; but alſo the witneſs of the Reverend Brother, whom you know was then preſent: together with the computation of time, which ſpeaks it to me to be above contradiction. It was *May* 3. that we ſpake together; as I well know by the errand, that I had at that time into thoſe parts: and my book ſaw not the light, till towards the end of *November* following; and yet made ſpeedy haſte, after it went out of my hands. I was glad of the opportunity, as of a brief diſcourſe of ſome things, (as the little ſcantling of time would bear;) ſo alſo to underſtand your mind, in the thing already mentioned, before any further proceeding, that there might be no unbrotherly difference, which at that time you expreſs'd with all poſſible candor, for my encouragement in that way. Yet, you now complain, that I have given the firſt onſet, and ſo put you upon a neceſſity of this way of dealing againſt me; which you mention in your Preface Apologetical, and in this Prologue, and more at large in the Preface of your Confeſſion: preferring in your judgement a more private Collation, and enquiry into things; before this publique way of appearing in the Preſs. And indeed, I had it in my thoughts to have written to you, before I had any ſetled reſolution at all, any more to have appear'd in publique; & had done ſome little that way, as ſoon as your Aphoriſms came to light, (which was more than three years and an half, before my treatiſe of the Covenant was publiſhed, as may be ſeen, comparing the dates of either) but after-thoughts took me off: And indeed I ſee no cauſe of Repentance; conſidering the iſſue of things between you and others. After ſo much pains of writing on both ſides, I do not hear that any of thoſe eminently learned men, which you ſay from moſt parts of the land have taken this way, to impart their animadverſions, have at all prevail'd to change your mind. Neither do I hear, that any of your replies have wrought any change in them for ſatisfaction. And in the mean ſpace, thoſe elaborate writings on both ſides, are buried in your Study and theirs; and no other,

but

but your ſelves, have any benefit at all; Only we have their complaints (ſuch is humane frailty) that their names ſuffer in your publick writings. As to the Charge againſt me for making the firſt onſet, *I* had not appear'd at all, had *I* not upon other occaſions (which may be ſeen in my Preface) been put upon it, to come out in open view. And how far *I* ſtand guilty of that in which *I* ſtand charged, *I* deſire the indifferent Reader impartially to conſider. *In* that of Sacramental Seals, you had given me at leaſt ſome occaſion. When *I* had delivered my ſelf in private to you, and alſo made my judgment publick, that they ſeal conditionally; you are pleaſed peremptorily to determine the contrary. Herein being not alone unhandſomely cenſur'd by your Quæriſt, (with whom you there deal) but *terminis terminantibus* by you alſo gainſaid. I indeed make mention of your name, yet ſo, as almoſt wholly agreeing with you in the thing in queſtion, and differing in ſome notions and expreſſions only. *In* which, *I* made it my work to beat out the right meaning, for a true underſtanding; and in language, *I* hope, altogether without offence; And therefore that piece was ſcarce worthy the name of a difference. *In* one or two more problematicall things, *I* likewiſe mention your name, taking notice of your opinion; perhaps with ſome diſſent, as we are conſtrain'd to deal with all, ſince the pen-men of the Holy Ghoſt compleated that Canon. But for the points that are worthy the name of controverſall, (whether allready inſerted into the forgoing treatiſe, or following in this Poſt-ſcript) the Reader may ſee, that your name is not ſo much as once mentioned, unleſſe it be with approbation. *I* was loath indeed to appear your profeſſed adverſary, and more loath, to honour thoſe Tenents of which I had no other eſteem, with the mention of your name. Had you held like courſe with me, how inobſervant would the differences have been that are between us? Not many that read your Aphoriſms, read my treatiſe, and ſo on the contrary: and all Readers would not have obſerv'd the author of arguments, when the Man induſtriouſly is concealed. The offence of *Br.* againſt *Bl.* and *Bl.* againſt *Br.* would, howſoever have been avoided. *I* had indeed many debates with my ſelf, whether or no *I* ſhould not have totally waved all, that in oppoſition to that which *I* intended to publiſh, you had deli-

vered. My inclination to peace, and that great reſpect I had to you, led me ſtrongly that way. On the other hand, being reſolv'd upon a tract, in that method, and way, that found you in full oppposition; Conſcience of duty (to appear againſt all, where I was convinc'd that truth was oppoſed) put me upon it to deal with your arguments, yet with reſolution to let alone your name. So, that I think, the indifferent Reader will judge you, rather than I, (reſpective to theſe bickerings in this Apology of yours, where, in this publick way, you deal with me) to be the beginner. You are pleaſed to tell the Reader in the Preface to your Confeſſion, that you have uſ'd more care to avoid offenſive words to me, than any other; which cannot but much engage me. But truly Sir, to ſpeak of things, as they are, *I* am apprehenſive of not a little gall, in the ink that thou ſpent upon me, and take my ſelf to be much more bedabled through your writings, than the cauſe required. And indeed it is ſeldome the cauſe that *I* defend, that hears ſo much (which yet muſt fall before arguments, & not words,) as my weakneſs, as you endeavor to hold it forth to your Reader. Were it alone my thoughts, exceptions might ſoon be put in; but being all Readers thoughts, (as *I* think) as well as mine, there is no likely-hood that *I* am much deceived. *I* may over-value my ſelf, but others will not be ſo haſty to put that over-high eſteem upon me. Let your *Index* ſpeak, which appears in the vann; Many eyes will faſten there, that perhaps will look no further; And what honourable language Mr. *Bl.* upon all occaſion hears, will ſoon be diſcerned. But *I* hope *I* have learn'd better than to make returnes; *If I* can, *I* fain would avoid it. But to leave the Porch, and to get more neer into the Houſe. You ſee my thoughts in three particulars already laid down, in the preceding treatiſe. *I* was there reſolv'd to wave nothing that fairly came into my way; nor to take in any thing that was impertinent to the work in hand. The firſt, *I* muſt confeſs, is moſt in my thoughts, *viz.* *The intereſt that faith, which is ſhort of juſtifying, gives to Baptiſme.* In which you are pleaſed to charge me with a doctrine of a very dangerous nature; Though in all that you have ſaid, *I* hear not a word of any dangerous conſectary that followes upon it. And truly, Sir, if *I* ſhould have a thought of changing my opinion, *I* know not

not how to look to the end of the danger that will follow. I muſt firſt neceſſarily engage my ſelf, in an everlaſtiug Schiſm; being not able to find out a Church in the world of any intereſt, in which I ſhall dare in this account to hold Communion. I ſhall ſee in many members (unleſſ: I offer violence to my judgment) too clear ſymptoms of non-regeneration; and unbelief, as to that faith which juſtifies: And though this will not bear a ſeparation (as is clear in all the examples that we find to the contrary in the Scriptures, and the Epiſtles wrote from heaven to the Churches in *Aſia*) yet this conſideration of their non-baptiſm, will neceſſarily enforce it. Church-communiõ is not to be held with any that are no Church-members; But all in non-regneration (according to this tenent) are no Church-members, upon account of their non-baptiſm, or their null-baptiſm. And if I meet with men that are able to give a good account, (and as to men ſatisfying) of their regeneration; yet if there ever were a time, ſince their baptiſme, that they were unregenerate, that concludes the nullity of their former baptiſme. And being Baptized upon the account of their Fathers faith, That failing and falling ſhort of that which juſtifies (as often it doth) Their baptiſme fails; and I muſt upon my new taken up principle, renounce Communion, till they have made all good by a new baptiſme. And if I ſhall betake my ſelf to the *Antipædobaptiſts* (for ſo many of them as I do know, where I now live, or have lived, or hear of by report) I muſt upon all occaſions among them plead for Anabaptiſm; So ſlender ſignes of regeneration, but all on the contrary, being too evidently manifeſted for the moſt part by them. The great reaſon that ever *I* could gather from the principles of *Antipædobaptiſm*, why God ſhould ſo blaſt that way, whereſoever it appears (as you, after *Bullinger*, *Bucer* and many others, have abundantly ſhewn) is, the Schiſm in which they unavoidably engage themſelves. The whole face of Chriſtianity through the world, had their baptiſm in infancy; and this proving no more than the ſprinkling of a little common water, and meer mock-baptiſm, they are *eo nomine*, put upon a ſeparation, and neceſſitated to disband themſelves, and deny ſociety to the whole Church on earth. The like will (as appears to me) here follow upon this principle, That only the faith that juſtifies, gives title in a man of

Dangers that attend the reſtraint of right to Baptiſm to the Regenerate.

of years, either to his own (if unbaptized) or to his Childs baptiſme, upon the grounds before mentioned. And If *I* be here holpen out (as indeed *I* utterly deſpair) by any diſtinction of *Forum Dei*, or *Forum Eccleſiæ*, *Univocall*, or *Æquivocall*; what thoughts then ſhall *I* entertain of the Holy Scriptures? As you ſay of an opinion that you oppoſe, Confeſs. pag. 5. *when you do but open the Bible, you can ſeldome meet with a leaf that is not againſt them*; And *I* think your *Hyperbole* is very tolerable; The ſame, *I* think, *I* may aſſert of this opinion which here *I* oppoſe, if you except the book of *Geneſis*, and that needs not wholly to be excepted, as *Gen.*6.1. doth witneſſe. After the Church was gathered into a viſible body in *Abrabam*, the leaves are very rare, through the Old and New Teſtament, in which a man may not find, teſtimonies, or inſtances, of a people in Covenant-relation to God, and received by Circumciſion, or Baptiſm, into a Church-ſtate, in an unregenerate condition. Let Mr *Ball* be conſulted in his Friendly tryal, pag.192. What high titles, implying a Covenant-relation, are given to men of moſt vile qualifications? To which many more might be added. *They are called (ſaith he) by God himſelf, His People, His Children, A choſen People, An holy Nation, The peculiar People of God, The Daughter of Zion, The Daughter of his People, His pleaſant Plant, A right Noble Vine.* To which may be added, *Children of the Kingdome, Children of the Covenant, Heires of the promiſe, Saints, Believers, Diſciples*, Together with many compellations, *I am God, even thy God, &c.* And all of this (as this Reverend Author ſhews) of a People that were *a ſtiffnecked People, Fooliſh and Unwiſe; That did rebell againſt the Lord, That did not underſtand, were a moſt Sinfull Nation, As Sodom and Gomorrah*, paſſing *Sodom* and *Gomorrah* in iniquity. Here is enough to ſpeak a Covenant, and upon that account, intereſt in Circumciſion and Baptiſm. Yea theſe were called, *The People of the Lord*, and *the People of his holineſs*. And to come off with ſuch diſtinctions, that they were *equivocally*, not *univocally*, *nomically* & not *really* ſuch; That they had theſe names, as a Corps, or Picture hath the name of a man, is that boldneſs with Scripture on which *I* dare not adventure; Eſpecially finding thoſe great advantages and priviledges in Scripture annexed unto them. May not the worſt

of

of *Antinomians*, whom you follow with juſt indignation, give like anſwers, and find like ſtarting holds? when they deny any neceſſity of good works, and we bring Scripture Texts in the fulleſt and plaineſt way againſt them, May not they reply, that all this is reſpective to our carriage towards men, and not, as to any notice that God takes of them, either as to diſpleaſure or acceptance? That they are not neceſſary *in foro Dei*, but in *foro humano* onely. As *Trask* in a journey that he made into *Stafford-ſhire*, there delivered, That a Chriſtian was to live amongſt men, as though he were under the obligation of the Law of God, (or words to that purpoſe) but muſt not account himſelf obliged. And I once heard one that had got into a Pulpit, pretending to advance Chriſt, (but in ſuch a way, as I hope I ſhall hear no more) mentioning Sanctification, he ſaid, There was ſuch a thing indeed reſpective to man, but God regards it not; And objecting the Apoſtle's words 2 *Cor.* 8. 12. *If there be a willing mind, it is accepted, according to that which a man hath, and not according to that which a man hath not*, This he ſaid was not any acceptation of God, but of the Saints. I muſt confeſs the gloſs with me, is alike in the one, as in the other; and either of both, ſuch, as the Text will not bear. Not that I charge all that hold that tenent, as ſo highly guilty. They ſee not (as is plain, in that they deny) the connexion between them, as the Ubiquitaries deny that any thing that they hold is deſtructive to the humane nature of Chriſt; but with me, the conſequences before mentioned, are palpable. And if on the other hand, when God ſayes *Hear O my people, and I will teſtifie againſt thee, I am God even thy God*, Pſal. 50. 7. *I entred covenant with thee, and thou becameſt mine*, Ezek. 16. 8. I ſhall believe that God ſpeaks as he thinks; and that this covenant-relation is reall, and not barely equivocal, or nominal; I cannot ſee any danger that followes upon it. To leave this to your further thoughts, and the Readers more ſerious judgement, I come to that which is behind, which I think I may reduce to theſe three heads.

The Contents of this Poſtſcript.

1. Thoſe things, wherein you and I really differ in judgement.
2. Thoſe things, in which there is an agreement between us.
3. Thoſe things, which we on either ſide problematically diſpute, and enquire into.

In the first, I believe your business is to beat down error, and find out truth; In the second, your end might be judged to be onely to discover my weakness, (being satisfied with my Tenent, but unsatisfied it seems with my reasons) but you profess other, and better intentions; In the third, I believe that amidst what seems doubtful, you would fain find out that on which you might fix as certain: In all of these I would willingly be brief upon a several account. 1. There is none of them in which this Treatise doth directly engage me, and that, at this time is my work; And I think I had never appeared at all in any of these, had not this work led me to it. 2. I would not be thought to have a mind to differences, when indeed my endeavour is to take my mind off them. 3. I doubt I shall put the Reader to too much cost and pains. The Book it self is of that bulk (though I hope of a necessary subject) that he may be tyred, before he comes at the Postscript.

SECT. I.

Faith in Christ, quà Lord, is not the Justifying Act.

THe first of those points which you have made choyce of, is, *That the acceptation of Christ, as a Lord, and not onely as a Priest, doth justifie,* In opposition to some passages of mine Chap. 12. pag. 79. of my Treatise of the Covenant. In all of which, as I do not name you, so I think there is never a sentence that is positively yours; so that, had not you thus owned it, few would have observ'd it. I there say what you repeat, [That, it is true, that faith accepts Christ as a Lord, as well as a Saviour; but it is the acceptation of him, as a Saviour, not as a Lord, that justifies: Christ rules his people as a King, teacheth them as a Prophet, but makes attonement for them onely as a Priest, by giving himself in sacrifice, his blood for remission of sins: These must be distinguished, but not divided: Faith hath an eye at all, The blood of Christ, The command, The doctrine of Christ; But as it fastens on his blood, so it justifies. He is set out a propitiation through faith in his blood, *Rom.* 3. 24. not through faith in his command.

mand. It is the blood of Christ that cleanseth all sin; and not the Soverainty of Christ. These confusions of the distinct parts of Christs Mediatorship, and the speciall offices of faith, may not be suffered. Scripture assignes each it's particular place and work; Soveraignty doth not cleanse us, nor doth blood command us: Faith in his blood, not faith yielding to his soveraignty, doth justifie us.]

Mr. Brs. reply analized.

In your reply to this passage of mine, you

1. Acquit me of any further error, then what is found in my method, affirming, *that I agree with you in* substantiâ rei.

2. You lay down six several distinctions.

3. You lay down nine propositions. All of which, both distinctions and propositions, I believe you intended for illustration of the point in debate, but your Readers (and those neither of the younger nor duller sort) complaine of your obscuring of it.

4. You fall upon your charge of me, and here you charge, 1. My expressions, with confounding that, which was my business, as well as I could, to distinguish. 2. You charge my implications, or implyed sense (which it seems you far better know then I) with triple injustice. 1. *Against the truth and word of God.* 2. *Against the souls of men,* 1. *In such nice mincing & cutting the conditions of their salvation, to their great perplexity, if they receive my doctrine.* That which all complain of, in your *expressions*, you are pleased to blame me withall in my *implications*. Upon the comming out of your Apologie, I was wrote unto by an eminently-learned hand in these words. *I wish that it may not divert you from better employment, and namely your Treatise about the Sacraments, to which if you adjoyn as an appendix, something by way of reply to Mr.* Br. *not so as to trouble your self and others, (as Mr.* Br. *doth too much) with Logicall niceties, but to clear and confirm the main matter, I think it will be most convenient.* 2. I am charged, *as not affording one word of Scripture or reason*; when yet in those few words recited, I think the reader may see as many as in all your distinctions and propositions. Lastly and leastly (as you term it) my charge is *of evident injustice to my friend,* (For it is, as is said, no hard matter to know who I mean) *in charging him with confounding the distinct parts of Christs mediatorship.* I am expresly spoke to, and charged without injustice for con-

founding Chrifts actions, with mans faith; How truly let the Reader judge; And am yet guilty of injuſtice, in charging my implyed friend, in my implyed ſenſe, with ſuch a crime.

5. You excuſe your ſelf, for your not much troubling me with arguments; Giving your reaſon, *that you have done it, over, and over, to others.* Where *I* would have the Reader to obſerve, that you have other Adverſaries, beſides me, in this point, and thoſe of the moſt learned, who (as elſe where you ſay) have vouchſafed that condeſcenſion as to give in animadverſions. 2. That we hear none of theſe learned mens reaſons. A few words of mine let fall by the bie, are fallen upon, and elaborate learned Treatiſes of others lie dormant, induſtriouſly written on this ſubject.

6. You come in with your ten arguments; which it ſeemes you take to be a number below trouble. *It* would trouble you, *If I* ſhould ſay, your implyed ſenſe is, That they are ſuch, to which *I* may without trouble give in an anſwer.

7. You amplifie your tenth argument, with a large diſcourſe, and all of this before you can reach my words. *I* ſhould trouble the Reader in his purſe and patience, if *I* ſhould follow you in all theſe particulars, and indeed *I* was ſcarce ever brought ſo near to a non-plus. To ſpeak to all, Time will not ſuffer; and to take to ſome, and leave others, will expoſe me to cenſure. Your diſtinctions ſhould be look'd into, and if they had been either proved or explained, you had done your Reader a Favour. Your firſt diſtinction is between *Conſtitutive Juſtification, or remiſſion by the Goſpel-grant or Covenant*; and *Juſtification by the ſentence of the Judge.* *I* hope you do not make theſe two diſtinct Juſtifications, that ſo it ſhould be a diſtribution of a *Genus* into its *ſpecies*, So *I* think few Readers will own it. But if you mean by the former, a Juſtification wrought, and in it ſelf perfect and compleat, as your word conſtitutive would ſeem to imply; And by Juſtification by the ſentence of the Judge, Juſtification manifeſted and declared, then *I* freely yeeld. That is Juſtification in it ſelf, perfect and full, that renders a man bleſſed; And this your conſtitutive Juſtification, which you call remiſſion by the Goſpel-grant doth, *Pſal.* 32. 1. Commented upon by the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 4. 7, 8. Whether the Elect ſhall have any other juſtification, or this manifeſted, and more fully held out, let

His diſtinctions conſidered.

let Christ himself determine. At the day when God by him shall judge the world, he will pronounce this sentence, *Come yee blessed of my Father*, Matth.25.34. This Justification then by the sentence of the Judge is a manifestation of this blessedness, which is in remission and non-imputation of sin. Your next distinction is between, *Constitutive Justification as begun, and as continued or consummate.* And here *I* doubt not but you may distinguish, provided that you donot divide and make one condition to be required for the first, (as you use to do) *viz.* Faith only, and another (which is works) the condition of the second; When *David* through faith was put into a justified state, and after fell into sin, there was a necessity of his return in the order established of God. You may say, if you please, that *works* must now acquit him from this second guilt: but this *I* shall hardly imbrace. He sought in his faln condition, to have sin by free grace remitted, and to be purged with that, which Hysopin Ceremoniall purifications did typifie, *Psal.*51.7. A justified state is carried on in a way of obedientiall affiance; But faith in Christs blood, first and last doth only justifie. The Apostle speaks of the falls of the Children of God, when he sayes, *If any man sin*, 1 John 2.1. and tels us the way to be acquited, not any new, but the old and first way: *We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sin*; And *I* know no other way of propitiation, then through faiths in his blood. *I* know what you say, Pref. to your Confes. pag. 8. if *I* number right, *They are very different questions, How we are constituted just, or put into a justified state at our conversion*; & *How we are sentenced just, or justified at Gods Judgment seat.* You may if you please make them two questions, but were *I* to be Catechized by you, *I* should give you the same answer. And *I* believe *Paul* was of the same mind, when he desired *to be found*, (as *I* think, in judgment) *not having his own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousnesse which is of God by faith.* *I* think he could find no other, which would be as a Screen, or cover, to hide sin, or keep off the wrath of God. *He knew nothing by himself*; He could not therefore be charged as unbelieving or impenitent; *Yet he was not thereby justified*, 1 Cor. 4. 4. Be it faith as a work or other work of obedience, they are all within the

command of the Law; and *I* dare not reſt there for Juſtificati-on. And the Apoſtle acquaints us with no other way then faith for intereſt in this righteouſneſſe. You farther ſay in in the place quoted: *They that will needs (to the great diſgrace of their unaerſtandings) deny that there is any ſuch thing as juſtification at Judgment, muſt either ſay that there is no Judgment, or that all are Condemned; or that judging doth not contain Juſtification and Condemnation, as its diſtinct ſpecies; but ſome men ſhall then be judged, who ſhall neither be Juſtified nor Condemned.* All men have not their underſtandings elevated to one pitch, *I* know no Juſtification to be expected then, ſpecifically diſtinct from that which did precede. *I* would for the bettering of my underſtanding learn, whether this Juſtification at the day of Judgment be not a Juſtification of men already juſtified, yea of men already in poſſeſſion of their Crown, (except of thoſe who then are found alive) though not compleat, in regard of the abſence of the body; *I have fought a good fight,* (ſays the Apoſtle) *I have finiſhed my courſe, henceforth there is laid up for me a Crown of Righteouſnes,* 2 Tim. 4. 7, 8. At the end of his combat he receives his Crown. This muſt needs be, unleſſe we will be of the *Mortaliſts* Judgment, to deny any ſeparate exiſtence of the Soul; Or of theirs that aſſert the Souls-ſleeping: both of them againſt the Apoſtle, who ſaith, *To be abſent from the body, is to be preſent with the Lord,* 2 Cor. 5. 8. And upon that account, *had a deſire to depart, & be with Chriſt,* Phil. 1. 23. which preſent advantage ſeem'd to him to over-weigh, or at leaſt to ballance all the good that the Church might reap by his labour ſurviving. Your third diſtinction is between the *Phyſicall operation of Chriſt and his benefits, on the intellect of the Believer, per modum objecti apprehenſi, as an intelligible ſpecies; and the morall conveiance of right to Chriſt, and his benefit, which is by an act of law, or Covenant-donation.* If you call the firſt a Juſtification, then very bad men, in the Church on earth, and the worſt of Devils in hell, may be juſtified: They may have ſuch operations upon their underſtanding. You ſeem elſe where to diſtinguiſh between the acceptance of him by faith, and this morall conveyance of right. Your fourth diſtinction is between thoſe two queſtion, *What juſtifieth ex parte Chriſti,* and *what juſtifieth or is required to our juſtification ex parte peccatoris.*

Which

Which as it is laid, is without exception. Your fifth is, between *the true efficient causes of our Justification*, and the meer condition, *sine qua non*, *et cum qua*: Which *I* can scarse tell whether to approve or disapprove; with your comment upon it, *I* have spoken to it. Your last distinction is between *Christs meriting mans Justification*, and *this actuall justifying him by constitution or sentence*, which, as the fourth, is above exception.

Your propositions offer themselves in the next place to consideration.

1. You say, *Christ did merit our Justification, or a power to Justifie, not as a King, but by satisfying the justice of God in the form of a servant.* This *I* imbrace with thanks, and do believe that it will draw more with it.

2. You say, *Christ doth justifie* constitutivè, *as King and Lord*, viz. ut Dominus Redemptor, *i.e* Quoad valorem rei, *he conferreth it*, Ut dominus gratis benefaciens; *But* Quoad modum conditionalem conferendi, Ut Rector et Benefactor. *For it is Christs enacting the New Law, or Covenant, by which he doth legally pardon, or confer remission, and constitute us righteous, supposing the condition performed on our part. And this is not an act of Christ as a Priest or Sacrificer, but joyntly*, Ut Benefactor et Rector. Hereto me are *termini novi*, and *Theologia nova*. But let the terms alone of *Dominus, Redemptor, Rector, Benefactor*, That which you ascribe to Christ in this place, (so far as *I* understand) Scripture still gives to the Father. Christ gave himself *for us*, indeed, according to his Fathers command; but the Father gives him *to us*, and he that gave his Son, appoints the terms on which Justification and Salvation is to be obtained by him, *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish*, *John* 3.16.

So that this New Law (if you will call it so) is of the Fathers appointment, *John* 6.40. *This is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life.* And in this sense, if we will follow Scripture, The Father justifies, *Rom.* 8.33,34. *It is God that Justifies, who he is that condemneth?* Christs work, is to work us into a posture, to obtain it. The Father judicially acts in it.

3. You say, *Christ doth justifie by sentence as he is Judge,*

and

and King; and not as Priest. Answ. If he justifie by sentence, Then he condemnes by sentence, when yet he says, *Jo.* 12.47. *He judges,* (that is) *condemnes none.* The truth is, as the Psalmist speaks, *God is Judge himself,* Psal. 50.6. and the Apostle tells us, *he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousnesse, by the man whom he hath ordained,* Act. 17.31. This unquestionably Christ doth as King; but in this Kingly power, he is no other then the Fathers Agent, who hath set him on his holy Hill of *Zion,* Psal. 2. 6. He is therefore at the Fathers right hand, as prime in power for that work. Those that are next to him, that is chief, are so seated, and *Zebedees* Children look'd for it, in Christs temporall Kingdome. When this is done, Christs mediatory power will be finished, and he shall give up his Kingdome to the Father.

4. You say, *Sententiall Justification, is the most full, compleat and eminent Justification, That in Law being,* quoad sententiam, *but vertuall Justification. Answ.* To this *I* have spoken upon the first distinction.

5. You say, *Faith justifies not, by receiving Christ as an object; which is to make a reall impression and mutation on the intellect; according to the nature of the species, I say to justifie is not to make such a reall change, &c. Answ.* To this *I* have spoke under that head of the instrumentality of faith. The works ancedent to this of Justification, as Humiliation, Regeneration, faith, imply a reall change. Such a change is wrought in the Justified Soul, though the act of Justification do not work it.

6. You say, *Faith can have no physicall causation or efficiency in Justification, seeing that the work to be done by us, is not,* nosmetipsos Justificare *either in whole or in part, &c.*

7. You say, *The legall formall interest, or conducibility of faith towards Justification, cannot therefore be any other then that of a condition in the proper Law sense, &c.*

I have spoken to both of these in the place last mentioned.

8. You say, *Scripture doth not say* (*that you can find*) *that faith justifies, but that we are justified by faith, and therefore* (you say) *you use the latter phrase, rather then the former. Ans.* This sure comes to fill up, or make a number, To say that we are justified by faith, and not that faith justifies, is a distinction without a difference: We have warmth by Clothes, but Clothes

Clothes do not warm us. Faith hath no lesse efficiency in Justification, then in miraculous cures, and yet in them faith made whole.

9. You say, *Though* ex parte Christi, *our severall changes proceed from his severall benefits, and parts of his office exercised for us; Yet* ex parte nostri, *i.e.* fidei, *it is one intire apprehension or receiving of Christ, as he is offered in the Gospel, which is the condition of our interest in Christ, and his severall benefits; and the effect is not parcelled, or diversified, or distinguished from the severall distinct respects that faith hath to its object, &c. Answ.* It is well that this is confessed, on the part of Christ. And I think you cannot shew, why Christ should undergo this variety of functions in his Mediatorship, and make them known to us likewise; That we should be taught in our Catechism (which is so honoured with your approbation) *That Christ executeth the office of a Prophet, in revealing to us by his word and Spirit, the will of God for our Salvation; That he executeth the office of a Priest, in his once offering up of himself a Sacrifice to satisfie divine Justice, and reconcile us to God, and in making continuall intercession for us; That he executeth the office of a King in subduing us to himself, in ruling and defending us*, if our faith is not to observe, which way these various priviledges accrue unto us; Why does the Scripture so distinctly speak of them, if we may not distinctly consider them? Must our intellect go without our faith in this thing? I think it may be proved, that the Saints faith, hath thus distinctly acted. In danger of enemies they go to God in Christ, in consideration of his soveraignty, As *Jehoshaphat*, 2 Chron. 20.6. *O Lord God of our Fathers, art not thou God in heaven, and rulest not thou over all the Kingdomes of the heathen, and in thy hands is there not power and might, So that none is able to withstand thee? &c.* Under a cloud of ignorance to go to him as a teacher, We see the censure that the Psalmist passes upon himself, *So foolish was I and ignorant, I was as a beast before thee*, and presently addresses himself to God, *Thou shalt Guide me with thy counsell, and bring me unto glory*, Psal. 73. 22, 24. Under the burthen of sin, to look to be clensed and purged; To what else did the sacrifices tend? and why else did *David* make his addresse? *Wash me thoroughly from my sin; Deliver me from blood-guiltinesse.* Here I must lay down certain

Propoſitions tending to explain the Authors meaning

propoſitions, in a more full way to explicate my ſelf.

1. That theſe ſeverall functions of Chriſt muſt be diſtinguiſhed, but may not be divided; He that is one is all, Chriſt a Prieſt doth rule, Chriſt a King doth merit and teach, Chriſt a Prophet doth both merit and rule: But as a Prieſt he doth not rule, as a King he doth not merit; he is ſtill one, in all of theſe functions, but acts under a diſtinct notion.

2. There is a neceſſity of the actuall improvement of his Kingly and Prophetick office, to bring men into a Juſtified ſtate; and to bring Juſtified ones to the end of their Juſtification. There muſt be light to lead men to Chriſt, power to ſubdue men unto him, as well as a price paid to reconcile them. When the price of our redemtion is paid by Chriſt, and not publiſhed, it is like the hid treaſure, by which no man hath advantage: Yea, were it made known, and by faith applied and brought home, our enemies yet are ſo potent and numerous that they would ſtill prevaile againſt us. Being redeemed by a price out of the hands of the Fathers Juſtice, we muſt be reſcued by a power out of the hands of Sathan; When his right determines, (as it is with many unjuſt poſſeſſors) he will yet keep his hold.

3. Our faith hath reſpect to whole Chriſt, to every part and piece of his Mediatorſhip. *It* yeelds to his ſoveraignty, is guided by his counſell, and reſts in his attonement. So that the faith which Juſtifies looks at his Kingly office, at his Prophetick office, as well as at his Prieſtly office, but not as it juſtifies. *Quà* teaching, it looks upon him as a Prophet, and learns; *Quà* ruling, it looks upon him as a King, and ſubmits to him; *Quà* ſacrificing, and making atonement, it looks upon him as a Prieſt, and reſts there for acquitall and diſcharge. Where the Goſpel diſtinguiſhes, our faith is diſtinctly to act and look.

As to the charge laid againſt me, *I* ſhall ſay little. *I* had rather ſpeak for truth then for my ſelf. You tell me, *that my expreſſions confound Chriſt and his actions, with mans faith in our Juſtification, or theſe two queſtions* [*by what we are Juſtified* ex parte Chriſti] *and* [*by what we are Juſtified* ex parte noſtri.] For anſwer, *I* only leave it to the Readers eyes, whether I do not mention, [our faith] as diſtinct from [the blood of Chriſt] in the words by you recited; And it is faith by which we

are

are Justified *ex parte nostri*. The implyed sense which you accuse, *I* shall further consider in some expresse reasons.

Now for your arguments, we have ten in number, and not above two of them conclude the proposition in question.

Mr. Brs. Arguments examined.

Your first concludes, *That Christ is not received as Christ, if not as Lord-Redeemer*, which is a new phrase, which *I* remember not, that I have read before *I* read this Apology. For Answer, *I* say Christ is to be received as the Lord our Redeemer, and as our Master or Teacher, but faith in Justification, eys Redemption, not Dominion.

Your second concludes from the authority of the Assembly, *That Justifying faith is the receiving of Christ, as he is offered in the Gospel; But he is offered in the Gospel as Saviour and Lord.* All which is that which never was denyed.

Your third concludes, *That to save from the power of sin, is as true a part of a Saviours office, as to save from the guilt*, which is not at all to the question. Saving from the power of Sin, Sanctifies, and not Justifies.

Your fourth, *Of faiths receiving Christ, as he Justifies us*, affirming, *that he Justifies us, as King, & Judge, and Benefactor*, is the same, for ought *I* can discern, with your tenth, and there is to be considered.

Your fifth is, *If receiving Christ as Satisfier and Meritor, be the only faith that gives right to Justification; then on the same grounds we must say, It is the only faith that gives right to further Sanctification and to Glorification.* If you put this argument into form, the word [*meritor*] will be found æquivocall, and the Syllogism to consist of four termes. We look at Christ for Justification, as satisfying Justice, and meriting pardon and remission, not as meriting Sanctification.

Sixthly you say, *Rejecting Christ as a King, is the condemning sin, therefore receiving him as King, is the Justifying faith.* This is like the old argument, Evill works merit condemnation, *Ergo* good works merit salvation. An ill meaning damnes, *Prov.* 21. 27. Our good meaning therefore saves. I further answer, Rejecting Christ as a King, is a sin against the Morall Law, which damnes: Yet somewhat more then subjection to the Morall Law is required, that a sinner may be saved. You give in your reason of your consequent, *Because unbelief, say you, condemneth, (at least partly) as it is the privation of the*

Justifying Faith; explaining your self, that you speak of that condemnation, or peremptory sentence, which is proper to the New Law. To this I answer, Unbelief, if we speak properly, doth not at all condemne, further then as it is a breach of a Morall Commandment. The privation, of which you speak, only holds the sentence of the Law in force and power against us: which me thinks should be your judgment as well as mine, seeing you are wont to compare the New Law (as you call it) to an Act of Oblivion, And an Act of Oblivion saves many, but condemnes none: If a Traytor, or Murtherer be exempted in any such Act of Oblivion, it is their crime that condemnes them, only the Act provides no remedy for them. It harmes them not, only it does not help them. If one of those which were stung by the fiery serpent, *Numb.* 21. had refused to have look'd on the brazen serpent, The sting had been his death, and such obstinate refusall had kept him from the meanes of cure.

Your seventh is, *Kissing the Son, and submitting to him, as King, is made the condition of escaping his wrath: Answ.* If you had said A condition, you had spoken fairlier [The condition] implies the sole condition. The yeelding up of our selves to him in all his functions, as the Lords Christ, vers. 2. is there understood, which is of necessity in all that will escape his wrath.

Eighthly, you say, *Matth.* 11. 28, 29, 30. *The condition of ease and of rest (from guilt as well as power of sin) is our comming to Christ as a teacher and example of meeknesse and lowlinesse, and our learning of him, a taking on us his yoke and burthen. Answ.* This text shewes the duty of men to be, not alone to seek rest and ease from Christ, but to learn of Christ, and follow him: But neither their learning nor their imitation, but faith in his blood, is their freedome, or Justification.

Ninthly, you say, *That faith which is the condition of salvation, is the condition of Justification or remission: But it is the receiving of Christ as King, as well as a satisfier, that is the condition of our salvation; Therfore, &c. Answ.* Here the Conclusion is falsly granted. You know that we yeeld, that the faith that accepts Christ as a King, Justifies: But that is not the Justifying act. The hand hath more officers then one; It works as well as receives; and so hath faith. And that there is more required as a condition to Salvation then to Justification, (speaking of it in Scripture phrase

phrase) you yeeld sufficiently, where you distinguish of Justification begun, the condition whereof is faith only, and Justification consummate, there you bring in Repentance and Obedience; That which you call Justification begun, is Justification properly so called. Faith only is serviceable to reconcile us unto God; but there is more required for reparation of our qualifications, to hold us up in communion with God. Of this I have spoke, Chap. 12, 13, 14. of my treatise of the Covenant.

Your tenth and last reason is, *If accepting Christ a Lord Redeemer be the* fides quæ Justificat, *i. e.* quæ est conditio Justificationis, *then it is meerly, strictly, and properly the Justifying act of faith, as the accepting of Christs righteousnesse is: But the Antecedent* (you say) *is granted by all Divines that you have to do with*: Therefore, &c. *Answ.* If they grant your Antecedent simply, as in this phrase you deliver it, I much marvell. This seemes to imply that Christ acted *quà* Lord, in paying the price of our Redemption: and that this work of his, is to be referred to his exaltation, and not to his state of humiliation: And I am sure the Scripture speaks otherwise. That which I yeeld is, That the faith which accepts Christ who is our Lord and Redeemer, is the faith which Justifies, and the condition of our Justification; But as it lookes upon Redemption a sacrificing act of Priest-hood, done by him who is indeed a Lord and King, sit only Justifies. But this distinction of *Fides quæ Justificat*, and *Fides quà Justificat*, is (as you are pleas'd to say) *the generall cheat*, so that your Antecedent it seemes is granted you, by all those Divines with whom you deal, under this limit; And as it seems, you have met with a pack of impostors, & that of the most learned in the Land, that out of their great condescension, have written for your satisfaction. This word, you think, sounds harshly from Mr. *Crandon*, as indeed it doth, and is no small blemish to his great paines, you may then judge how it will take from your self, in the eare of others: And I much marvell that this distinction, that every where else would passe, and be confessed to be of necessity, to avoid confusion in those distinct capacities, in which men usually act, should here not alone be questioned, but thus branded. Does not every man that undergoes various relations variously act according to them? And do not men that make addresse, addresse themselves in like variety? He that is

The distinction as *fides quæ* and *fides quà*, asserted.

at once, a Husband, a Parent, a Master, a School-master, a Physician, acts variously according to all of these capacities. Some come to him as a *father*, some as a *Master*, some as a *Teacher*, all of them come unto him, as a Physician; But only they that come to him, as a Physician, are cur'd by him. Believers through faith go to Christ, that bears all the relations mentioned; But as they seek satisfaction in his blood-shedding, which is an act of his Priest-hood, they are justified. Learned *Amesius* may worthily be rank'd in the first place amongst those that you thus honour. As soon as he enters upon the dispute of justifying faith, in answer to *Bellarmines* first question, *What that faith is that is required to justification?* he sayes in the name of Protestants, (a) *This is either unskilfully or sophistically put to the question*, giving in his reasons. 1. Saith he, *There are many things required to justification, which do not justifie.* 2. *It is not so much enquir'd into, what that faith is, which do's justifie; as in what notion it is that it is said to justifie?* And giving answer to farther words of *Bellarmine*, he saith in the same page, that (b) *Protestants do not restrain the faith* [*which*] *justifies, but faith* [*as*] *it justifies, to the promise of mercy.* Much more may be seen in this Author in his next Chapter, Sect. 1. Sect. 8. which *I* leave to the Reader to consult at pleasure. And together with it, that which may be seen largely in *Chemnitius*, enquiring into the proper object of justifying faith, in his *Examen Concil: Trident: mihi* pag. 159. under this head, *Quid verè & propriè sit fides justificans, & quo sensu scriptura velit intelligi, quando pronunciat impium fide justificari.*

I shall here take the boldness to give in my arguments to make good, that faith in Christ, *quà* Lord, doth not justifie.

1. That which the types under the Law, appointed for attonement and expiation, lead us unto in Christ, our faith must eye for attonement, expiation, and reconciliation; This cannot be denied; These Levitical types lead us doubtless to a right object, being School-masters to lead us unto Christ, and shaddows whereof he is the substance; As also to that office in him (who is the object of faith) that serves for this work: But these types lead us unto Christ in his Priestly office, for the most part as Sacrificing, sometimes as interceding, *John* 1. 29. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. 1 *Pet.* 1. 18. A great part of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is a proof of it.

2. Tha,

(a) *Hoc ipsum vel imperitè, vel sophistice, in quæstionem vocatur. Nam,* 1. *Multa ad justificationem requiruntur quæ non justificant.* 2. *Non tam quæritur quæ, aut quid fides quæ justificat, quam quæ sit ratio quâ propriè dicitur justificare.*

(b) *Observandum est, nos non restringere fidem illam quæ justificat, sed tantum quà justificat, ad promissionem misericordiæ.*

Arguments evincing that faith in the blood of Christ only justifies.

2. That which the Sacraments under the Gospel, setting forth Christ for pardon of sin, lead us unto, That our faith must eye, for Reconciliation, Pardon, and Justification; This is clear, Christ in his own instituted ordinances, will not misguide us: But these lead us to Christ suffering, dying for the pardon of sin, *Mat.* 26. 28. *This is my blood in the new Testament shed for you, and for many for the remission of sins.* Here is a confirmation of both these arguments in one; The types of the Law, and the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, lead both of them to his blood, for this reason of attonement and forgiveness. There was an old Testament enjoyn'd of God, in which the people in convenant were sprinkled with blood, *Exod.* 24. 1, &c. commented upon by the Apostle, *Heb.* 9. 20, &c. That blood, and this cup, lead to Christs blood for forgiveness, and in them the death of Christ is remembred. A broken, bleeding, dying Christ, in the Lords Supper is received.

3. As the Spirit of God guides faith, so it must go to Christ for propitiation and attonement; This needs no proof; The Holy Ghost is the best leader: But the Holy Ghost guides our faith to go to the blood of Christ for attonement, *whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood,* Ro. 3. 25. It is blood is our propitiatory or mercy seat: We are justified by his blood, *Rom.* 5. 9. And faith is our way of interest, and thither the Spirit of God, by the Apostle, leads our faith, as we see in the words mentioned. I am checkt indeed by you, because I say, *through faith in his blood, not faith in his command: quo jure nescio,* say you. My reason, or warranty is; because I durst not adde to the Apostles directory; when he leads us one way, I dare look no other. If he had intended to have led us to Christ as a propitiation, without further direction, under what notion our faith should have look'd upon him; It had been enough to have said, that he is our propitiation: but distinctly pointing out [his blood] and [faith in his blood] I think I have warrant sufficient to lead souls hither, and only hither: especially seeing I find him still in the same language, *Rom.* 5. 8, 9. *God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ dyed for us, much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath, through him. In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of our sins,* Ephes. 1. 7. *The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from*

from all sin, 1 *John* 1. 7. *For as much as ye know that we were redeemed——with the precious blood of Christ, as a Lamb without blemish.* You demand, *Will you exclude his obedience, resurrection, intercession?* To which I only say, I marvail at the question; If I exclude these, I shall exclude his blood; His shedding of blood was in obedience, *John* 10. 18. *Phil.* 2. 8. His resurrection was his freedom from the bonds of death, and an evidence of our discharge by blood: His intercession is founded on his blood; He intercedes, not as we, by bare petition, but merit: He presents his blood as our high Priest in the holy of holies. You tell me further, that the thing I had to prove, was not the exclusion of [faith in his commands] but of [faith in Christ as Lord and teacher.] I can no more distinguish [Lord] and [command] then I can [blood] and [sacrifice] it being the office of a Lord to rule, as of blood to make attonement. You yet tell me, *It was fittest for* Paul *to say* [*by faith in his blood*] *because he intends to connote both what we are justified by,* ex parte Christi, *and what we are justified by,* ex parte nostri, *but the former principally.* To this I say, If this were fittest for *Paul*, then it is unfit for any to come in with animadversions, and tell us of any other thing, either *ex parte Christi*, or *ex parte nostri*, for justification. I pray you rest here, and we are well agreed. Here is Christs Priestly office on his part alone, and I am resolved to look no further.

4. Our faith must look upon Christ so as to obtain righteousness by him, by vertue of which we may appear before God as righteous: But it is by his obedience as a Servant, that we obtain righteousness, and stand before the Lord as righteous, *Rom.* 15. 19. *By the obedience of one, many are made righteous.*

5. That way that Christ took to bring us to God, our faith must eye and follow: But Christ by death, the sacrifice of himself, brings us to God, 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.*

6. As Christ frees us from the curse, so he justifies us, and in that notion our faith must look unto him for justification. This is plain; Justification being no other but our acquittall from the curse, which is the sentence of the Law of *Moses*, Acts 13. 38. But Christ frees us from the curse, in suffering as a sacrifice, not rulingas a Lord, *Gal.* 3. 13. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.*

I said in my Treatise of the Covenants, [there are severall acts of justifying faith, *Heb.* 11. but those are not acts of justification. It is not *Abrahams* obedience, *Moses* self-denyal, *Gideons* or *Sampsons* valour, that was their justification, but his blood that did enable them in those duties by his Spirit; *Paul* went in these duties as high as they; and I doubt not, but he overtopt them; yet he was not thereby justified.] Here are many exceptions taken. 1. At the phrase [an act of justification] with much ado made to know my meaning, when I had thought all had well enough understood it: You would fancy that I mean that justification it self acts, speaking of it, not as an object, but an efficient; but I must acquaint you, that it implies, that justification acts, when I speak of the acts of justification, as it doth, that harvest works, when I speak of harvest-work. I mean acts tending to justifie, or exercis'd in, or about justification. 2. It is demanded, *Who knows whether you mean that none of those acts*, Heb. 11. *are acts of justification? The proper importance of your words*, say you, *is for the former: but that*, (say you) *is a dangerous untruth*, giving in v. 13. as an exception against it. *Answ.* I intended the generality of those acts there ascribed to faith, in that indefinite speech of mine, which you cannot make necessarily to be universall. You have justly made exception of one, *vers.* 13. which in my ministeriall way, preaching on those words, I have interpreted, as you say, our Divines do. It seen s by you, that I have our Divines in the rest siding with me. 3. You tell me, *you should not* (*in my judgement*) *have called* [Abrahams *obedience*, Moses *self-deniall*, Gideons *valour*] *acts of justifying faith. Are these acts of faith? If you mean*, (say you) *that these acts are fruits of faith, it is true, or if you mean that an act of faith did excite the soul, &c. Answ.* And should the Apostle have then said that they were done by faith? Is not this his error, as the former is mine? I pray you what was that [work of faith] that the Apostle mentions, 1 *Thes.* 1. 3? Faith wrought and acted somewhat. 4. You demand, *what mean you to say, obedience and valour was not their justification? Answ.* If no act of faith, *sano sensu*, by an ordinary *Metonymy*, may be said to be justification, make then a comment upon the Apostles words, *Rom.* 4. 3. where to overthrow justification by works, and to establish justification by faith, he sayes, *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness:*

which is as much as, it was his justification. That which is a prevalent plea in any Court to obtain justification, is not unfitly called justification. Faith in Christs blood is such a plea, and therefore not unfitly called our justification. Your fifth and sixth need not to have been put into two; *Then how come you to say next*, (say you) *that it is Christ's blood? The blood of Christ is the meritorious cause of our justification, &c. But I thought the contest in your dispute had been, which is the justifying act of faith, and which not? And therefore when you denyed those in* Heb. 11. *to be acts of justification, (which I am forced to interpret [justifying acts] I expected to find the true act asserted; but instead of that, I find the opposite number, is [The blood of Christ.] Is this indeed the controversie? Whether it be [accepting Christ as Lord] or [the blood of Christ] that justifieth? Never was such a question debated by me, in the way here intimated. I am wholly for you, if this be the doubt.* Here you meet with the greatest advantage, that I think in my Treatise you any where find; when *I* say, [these acts were not their justification] and put in opposition, [but his blood who did enable them to duties by his Spirit,] it should have been faith in his blood who did enable them to these duties; but each one may see, and some have said, (that before we read this objection of yours,) that it is plain that I meant it. Seventhly you tell me, *It would prove an hard task to make good that there are several acts of justifying faith by which one are not justified, without flying to great impropriety of speech. Answ.* I believe you think, that justifying faith includes in it, all those kinds of faith that Scripture mentions, as Faith Dogmatical, or Historical, and (in all that had the gift of miracles,) Faith miraculous. They had not one faith, whereby they had their interest in Christ, and another whereby they gave assent to Divine truths, and a third whereby they wrought miracles: And to say that we are justified by such assent, or they, by such miracles, I think were a speech more then improper. You say further, That *by justifying faith, I must mean the act, habit, or renewed faculty.* And I wonder you could have it in your thoughts, that I should mean the last. Then you would willingly engage me in a dispute, *whether that the acts and habits of mans soul, are of so distinct a nature, that where the acts are specifically distinct by the great distance and variety of objects, yet the habit producing all these is one and the same.*

To

To which I ſay no more for anſwer, but that I ſhall take it for granted, till I ſee (as yet I do not) convincing reaſon againſt it. Eighthly you tell me, that 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. *is nothing to our buſineſs.* Paul *was not his own juſtifier. Though he knew not matter of condemnation* (ſenſu Evangelio) *for no doubt he knew himſelf to be a ſinner*) *yet that did not Juſtifie him; becauſe it is God only that is his Judge. Anſw.* I believe that you give a right comment on the Apoſtles words, as to the firſt branch. He was one whoſe heart, as *John* ſpeaks, condemn'd him not; but your reaſon why he was not therby juſtified is very ſtrange: Becauſe, ſay you, that it is God onely that is his Judge. And thus then the Apoſtle argues; God onely is Judge to juſtifie: But my innocency, or integrity is not God: Therefore it doth not juſtifie. *It* ſeemes that *Abrahams* works with you are God, for you tell us preſently that he was juſtified by them. The Apoſtle indeed addes, in the following words, *He that judgeth me is the Lord*; But thoſe words have not reference to theſe now in hand, as is plain in the context, but to that which he had ſpoken to verſ. 3. *With me it is a very ſmall thing that I ſhould be judged of you, or of mans Judgment, yea I judge not mine own ſelf*, to which theſe words come in direct oppoſition, *But he that judgeth me is the Lord.* And thus then the Apoſtle here argues, He that muſt ſtand to the Judgment of the Lord, may account it a very ſmall thing to be judged of men: But I muſt ſtand to the Judgment of the Lord: *Ergo.* I think the Reader may find a better interpretation of this text from Mr. *Ball*, quoted by me in this treatiſe, which might be ſeconded by the authority of ſeverall others, and ſuch (as he ſayth) renders the text ſtrong againſt Juſtification by works. When you have expounded the words as you have done, they ſerve to ſhut out all works, in which *Paul* ever appear'd, from Juſtification. There followes ſuch an inference that you would hardly bear with from another. *Can you hence prove* (ſay you) *that accepting Chriſt as a Lord is not the condition of Juſtification then you may prove the ſame of the accepting of him as a Saviour.*

It ſeemes every word in a whole treatiſe muſt immediatly of it ſelf, formally prove the main thing that is in queſtion. It proves that works parallel to *Abrahams* offering *Iſaack*, or leaving of his Country, are none ſuch whereby men are juſtified. It fully proves that which the next words ſeems to diſprove.

James 2 24. vindicated.

I brought in by way of objection that text of [*James*, and endeavoured to give some answer to it: *James* indeed saith, that *Abraham* was Justified by works, when he had offered *Isaack* his Son on the Altar, *Jam.* 2. 21. But either there we must understand a working faith, with *Pisator*, *Pareus*, and *Pemble*, and confess that *Paul* and *James* handle two distinct questions, The one, whether faith alone Justifies without works? which he concludes in the affirmative; The other, what faith Justifies? Whether a working faith only, and not a faith that is dead and idle? Or else I know not how to make sense of the Apostle, who streight infers from *Abrahams* Justification by the offer of his Son, And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousnesse.* How otherwise do these accord? He was Justified by works, and the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, he was Justified by faith?] Here are many exceptions taken, *If* James *must use the term* [*works*] *twelve times in thirteen verses, a thing not usuall, as if he had fore-seen how men would question his meaning, and yet for all that we must believe, that by* [*works*] James *doth not mean* [*works*] *it would prove as hard a thing to understand the Scripture, as the* Papists *would perswade us that it is.* *Answ.* First, it seemes the difficulty of interpretation is supposed, when the word is used 12 times so near together, otherwise I doubt not but your self wil confesse a necessity of interpretation of this kind, which yet you would be loath to have branded with such absurdity. Secondly, If I durst take the liberty that others assume, the doubt were easily solved, and say, that *Paul* speakes of a *reall* Justification, *James* of an *equivocall*, which interpretation would far better suit here then else where. A dead faith is fit to work a dead Justification, and such as carries as full resemblance to Justification in truth, as a dead corps doth of a living man. Thirdly, were you to interpret that of *David*, Psal. 22. 6. *I am a worm and no man*, I think you would so interpret it, as to make him a man and no worm. But to leave Metaphors, and come to the Metonymies of this kind. How frequently are such found in Scripture? which inforce us to say, that not to be in strict Propriety of speech, what Scripture saies, is. He hath *made him to be sin for us*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. When yet we must say, he was not made sin, an entity cannot be made a *non ens*, or meer privation; He was made then an atonement

Metonymies frequent in Scripture.

atonement for sin, a sin-offering as we say, a Metonymy of the Adjunct. These *died in faith, having not received the promises*, Heb.11.13. They *had received the promises*, Rom. 9. 4. It is a contradiction to say, They died in the faith, and had not received the promise. It is taken there for the land promised; a Metonymy of the Object. When *Herod the King heard these things, he was troubled, and all* Jerusalem *with him*, Matth.2.3. *Jerusalem* was not troubled; It was alone the Inhabitants that were troubled, by a Metonymy of the Subject. *This is the Will of God, even your Sanctification*, 1 Thes. 4. 4. and this was not, *voluntas Dei*, but *res volita*, not the *Will of God*, but the *thing willed*, by a Metonymy of the Cause. A thousand more of these might be named, which yet are as well understood, as we understand each others common Language.

2. *Do but read* (say you) *over all these verses, & put* [*working faith*] *instead of* [*works*] *& trie what sense you will make? Answ.* Here is implyed, that, As [works] are taken in some of these verses, So they must be taken in all, If there be no Metonymy in all, then there is no Metonymy in any. As one, so all are to be understood. But if you please to consult *Gomarus* in his vindication of those words of Christ, *Matth.*23.27. Com.1.Pag.110.111. You will find frequent instances where the same word, in the self same place or verse, must be taken in a different sense; in one properly, and in the other figuratively. Interpreting those words, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem*, of the heads and leaders of the people of *Jerusalem*; there lies an objection against him, that in *Luk.* 13. 33. the words immediatly before are, *It cannot be that a Prophet should perish out of* Jerusalem, where the word *Jerusalem* is taken for the City it self, and not for the heads and leaders of the people. He answers, This consequence is weak: *For it is built upon a false ground, as though the repetition of the same word should also enforce the same sense, when contrawise according to the circumstance of the place, it may be taken in a different sence, as many illustr ous examples make manifest*; Instancing in *Joh.* 3. 17. *God sent not his Son into the world to condemne the world*, Where world in the first place signifies the earth, in the second place men on the earth, 2*Cor.* 5. 21. Him that *knew no sin, he made sin for us*, Where in the first place sin is taken properly, in the latter place by a Metonymy. 2 *Chron.*35.24. *And they brought*

One and the same word is often repeated in the same verse, or neer to it, in a different sense.

Infirma est hæc consequentia, nititur enim falsa hypothesi, quasi ejusdem verbi repetitio semper eundem sensum postularet: cum contra pro circumstantiarum ratione sæpe diverso sensu accipiatur, quemadmodum illustria ex empla demonstrant.

brought him to Jeruſalem, and he died, and was buried in one of the ſepulchres of his Fathers, and all Judah and Jeruſalem mourned for Joſiah. In the firſt place, *Jeruſalem* is taken for the City, in the ſecond place, for the Inhabitants of it. And ſo alſo, *Matth.*2.1,3. *There came wiſemen from the eaſt to Jeruſalem. When Herod the King heard theſe things, he was troubled, and all Jeruſalem with him*; With further inſtances which there may be ſeen, concluding, that therefore the ſuppoſition of the adverſaries is falſe, that the repetition of the ſame word muſt be allwaies in the ſame ſenſe.

3. *No doubt*, ſay you, *but* Paul *and* James *handle two diſtinct queſtions, but not the two, that you here expreſſe.* Paul *ſpeaks of meritorious works, which make the reward of debt and not of grace, if you will believe his own deſcription of them*, Rom.4.4. *But* James *ſpeaks of no ſuch works, but of ſuch as have a conſiſtency with grace, and a neceſſary ſubordination to it. I prove it: The works that* James *ſpeaks of we muſt endeavour for and perform, or periſh, (ſuppoſing time) but the works that* Paul *ſpeaks of, no man muſt endeavour, or once imagine that he can perform, viz. ſuch as make the reward to be of debt, and not of grace.* To this I anſwer, 1. That if *Paul* ſpeaks only of meritorious works, then according to you, he ſpeaks of no works at all, for there are none ſuch, no not in Angels, *Confeſs. Chap.*3.§.6: *Paul* ſpeaks in the place quoted of works where there is a reward of debt, and yet ſpeaks not as I conceive of works of merit, ſeeing, as he mentions none ſuch, ſo there are none ſuch. He excludes then works to which a reward is due, *vi promiſſi*, rather then *meriti*, As *Eph.*2. he excludes boaſting of works done by the help of grace: for there is a matter of boaſting in theſe, as we ſee in the *Phariſee*, Luk.18.11. 2. If *Paul* had here ſpoken of works of merit, and I muſt believe him, ſo elſewhere he ſpeaks of other works, and there both you and I are to believe him likewiſe. 1. He ſpeaks and excludes all the works that we have done, *Tit.*3.5. Which he univerſally oppoſes to Juſtification by free grace, v.7. and it is of faith, that it may be of grace, *Rom.*4.16. 2. He ſpeaks of and excludes all thoſe works, or that righteouſneſſe, which is not the righteouſneſſe of God by faith, *Phil.*8.8,9. that is, all the righteouſneſs that is inherent in us, and not in Chriſt alone, and made ours by faith: therefore he is called the Lord *our Righteouſneſſe*, Jer.

Paul excludes not only works of merit, but all works, from Juſtification.

23.

23.6. and said to be made of God unto *us righteousnesse*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. 3. He speaks of, and excludes, all those works which the Law commands, *Rom.* 3. 20. Now there is no work of grace but the Law gives it in charge, yea the Law commands to take in grace, wheresoever there is a tender of it, for our assistance, Requiring a duty, it requires all necessary helps to it. And therefore *Chemnitius* observes, that when the Apostle excludes the works of the Law from Justification, his intention is to exclude the highest and noblest, not only done by *Pharisees* or unregenerate persons, but *Abraham*, *David*, or the most eminent converts. 4. He speaks of and excludes all those works, that any man in the highest pitch of grace can attain unto, in the place quoted, 1 *Cor.* 4.4. *I know nothing by my self, yet I am not thereby Justified.* He knew no matter of condemnation say you, *sensu Evangelico*, he then kept up to that which God in the Gospel-Covenant calls for: And yet he is not thereby justified. Though God will not condemne a man of that integrity, through grace, yet this doth not justifie. *This place*, (saith *Cartwright* on the words) *is the death of your Justification by works. For if* Paul *knew nothing by himself (in that wherein the Corinthians might suppose him most guilty) and was not so much as in that point Justified before God, who is he that dares to Justifie himself before God in any work?* And *Fulk* on the words. *Paul doth acknowledge that he is not Justified by his faithfull service, and labour in the Gospel, therefore no man can be Justified by his works done of grace, in as great perfection as can be done of mortall man.* If the whole discharge of *Paules* ministeriall function, wherein he took heed to himself and to his doctrines, was not such whereby he could be Justified, How then could *Abraham* be justified in offering *Isaack*, or *Rahab* in her hiding of the spies? If the Apostle therefore do exclude works of merit, we see what works he also excludes with it. You futher say, Paul *speaks indeed of faith collaterally, but of Christs merits and free grace, directly and purposely: So that the chief part of* Pauls *controversie was, Whether we are justified freely through Christs merits, or through our own meritorious works. But* James *question is, Whether we are Justified by faith alone, or by faith with obedience accompanying it, and both, as subordinate to Christs merits. Answ.* Some will think that you judge *faith* not worthy

Paul treats diversly and industriously of Justification by faith.

thy to be named but on the *bie.* Who can be of your mind that reads the Apostle speaking so often, and so fully to the office of faith in Justification, but that his scope is no lesse to shew what justifies *ex parte nostri,* which it still faith, then what that is that justifies *ex parte Dei,* which is grace, or *ex parte Christi,* which is his blood or merit? Pauls *question,* you say *is of the meritorious cause of our Justification,* James *his question of the condition on our part.* If you are in the right, *Paul* certainly was much defective in his Logick. We think the question in debate is to be put into the Conclusion, & see how he concludes *Rom.*3. 28. *Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the works of the Law.* Inferences are made, and consectaries drawn from that which is mainly in dispute, and not from that which is collaterally mentioned, and upon the *bie* onely touched upon: Now he concludes from the doctrine of Justification by faith, mentioning as we see Justification *ex parte nostri,* peace with God through our Lord *Jesus Christ,* Rom. 5.1. You further say, *Paul speaks of Justification* in toto, *both in the beginning and progresse, but especially in the beginning, but* James *speaks only of Justification as continued, and consummate, and not as begun, For both* Abrahams, *and every mans was begun, before works of obedience.* I Answer, Then works do not consummate; for *Paul* casts off all works from this office, and he speaks, according to you, of Justification *in toto,* and if *James* speaks of it only as consummate, and finished, why does he instance in *Rahab,* this being the first that was heard of her being in faith or grace? The Authors that you follow are wont to say, that *Paul* speaks of the *first,* and *James* of the *second Justification,* and it had been more for your advantage, fully to have followed them, then to have said that *Paul* speaks principally of the first, yet speaks of the second likewise. Yet you may see how hardly those of that opinion have been put to it. *Bellarmine,* that knows as well how to stickle for an opinion as another, says, that *Paul speaking of the first Justication, fetches a proof from* Abraham, *which is understood of the second Justification: and* James *speaking of the second Justification, fetches a proof from* Rahab, *which is the first Justification,* which as long since I have observed, in the vindication of this text, agrees like harp and harrow. So that if the Authors that I follow have

have missed the meaning of these Apostles, those that follow you, are much lesse like to find it. Yet after all this labour, for a Reconciliation of this seeming difference between these great Apostles, the Reader stands much engaged for that which you have brought to light from Reverend Mr. *Gatakers* hand in his Letter written to you, where we see in what judgement he both liv'd and died, taking it up as (he saies) when he was a novice, and persisting in it to his last, wholly differing from you, and agreeing with me. *In* Paul *the question is* (saith he,) *of sin in generall, concerning which, when any man shall be therewith charged, there is no means whereby he may be justified, that is, justly assoyled from the otherwise just charge of being a sinner, but by his faith in Christs blood: Christs blood having made satisfaction to Gods Justice for sin, and his faith in it, giving him a right to it, and interest in it.* This he understands of all sin, through the whole course of a believers life; first and last, faith is his way of Justification; *Whereas in James saith he, the question is concerning some speciall sin, and the questioned persons guilt of it, or freedome from it.* What speciall sin he means, he explaines himself, to wit, *Whether a man be a true or counterfeit believer, a sound and sincere, or a false and feigned professor?* In which case any person that is so wrongfully charged, may plead not guilty, and offer himself to be tryed by his works, as in some cases Gods Saints have done, even with appeal to God himself. And what differs this from what I say? onely the faith that is not counterfeit, but evidenced by works, justifies. The truth of his faith is questioned, whensoever the sincerity of his profession is thus charged. This is no more then that which is ordinarily affirmed, that *faith justifies the person*, and *works justifie faith.*

The ordinary exposition of the word (faith) *Jam.* 2. 24. vindicated.

4. You say, *If with the named Expositors you understand by* [*works*] *a* [*working faith*] *either you grant as much as I affirme in sense, or else you must utterly nul all the Apostles arguing from* v. 13. *to the end.* *Answ.* It were too tedious to follow you through this large discourse, and you very well save me the paines, when you adde, *I suppose you will say, Faith which Justifies must be working, but it Justifies not,* qua operans; And so indeed I do say, and you answer, *true, not* quà fides, *i. e.* q à apprehendit objectum, *if the* [quà] *speaks the formall reason of its interest in Justification.* To this I say, If it neither Justifies

quà operans, nor *quà apprehendens objectum*, I would fain know how, or under what notion it justifies. Do's it justifie *nihil agendo?* I may well say, *Cedo tertium?* If you say, as I think you will, it justifies *quà conditio*: Is it *conditio, nec operans, nec apprehendens?* A faith neither *working*, nor *receiving*, is certainly as bad as the faith that *James* speaks of, that profits nothing. You demand further, *Why cannot faith Justifie except it be working?* I answer, Because if it be faith to apprehend or receive, then it is in life: for if not alive, it cannot receive: If it be alive, then it doth work. You say, *The Apostle doth not plead for a meer necessity of signification or discovery, but for a necessity, ut medii ad Justificationem, Even that Justification which he calls imputing of righteousness, and that by God.* I answer, He enquires what that faith is, that is *medium ad Justificationem*, and determines, that it is not a dead but a working faith, that is this Justifying *medium*, and this strengthens and not nuls the Apostles argumentation.

When you have made it your business to overthrow my interpretation, you set upon my reason, and say, *As for your single argument, here I answer.* And I may reply, 1. That one argument to the purpose, is to be preferred before 31 which are all besides the question. 2. That you might have found a double argument, but that you industriously leave out one, to make it single. You say, *it is a weak ground to maintain that James twelve times in thirteen verses, by* [*works*] *means not* [*works*,] *and by faith alone (which he still opposeth) doth not mean faith alone, and all this because you cannot see the connexion of one verse to the former, or the force of one cited Scripture.* And I hope I may without offence tell you, that this kind of reasoning, or answering, adds advantage, neither to your cause, nor reputation. You take it for granted, and would perswade your Reader, that if I suppose the word is once figurative, (where the proper acceptation is both destructive to the sense, and repugnant to the whole tenor of the Gospel, which was my second reason by you omitted) that I must therefore so interpret it all along. But you have had Scripture instances to the contrary, and are directed where you may be further furnished. I conclude, that when *James* affirms that faith without works is dead, and therefore cannot justifie, and sayes, *Abraham* was justified by works when he offered *Isaac*, which Scripture says

was

was a work of faith, or if that do not please, was done by faith, *Heb.* 11.17. and further sayes, that in his justification by works the Scripture was fulfill'd, which sayes, he was justified by faith; Is it not a fair interpretation to understand *a working faith*; wch is alone of possible power to justifie, when the Scripture also ascribing this instanced justifying work of *Abraham*, to the faith of *Abraham*, as we see, *Heb.* 11. 17.

In the close of your ten arguments you speak your sense of the danger which is like to follow upon this tenent; which I have thought most meet to reserve to this place. *What sad effects*, say you, *it may produce, to teach the world, that the onely justifying act of faith, is, the accepting of justification as merited by Christs blood, or the accepting of Christs righteousnes to justifie them, it is not hard for an unprejudic'd man to discern. For my part, in all my experience of the case of the ungodly that I have triall of, I can find no commoner cause of their generall delusion and perdition, then this very doctrine. Answ.* To this I might have many things to say.

Desperate Conclusions inferr'd from right principles.

1. It is the hard fate, (if I may say so) of Christian Religion to have inferences of this kind drawn from her principles. And yet the way of Christians hath not been, either to desert the principles from which they are drawn, nor yet to own or defend the inferences or conclusions that are drawn from them. The Apostle affirming that the exaltation of Gods glory, in not utterly casting of the Nation of the Jewes, was eminently seen in their disloyalty and covenant-breaking with him; Inference is presently made, that covenant-breaking, and disloyalty, cannot then be blamed. *If the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie to his glory: why yet am I also judged as a sinner?* That which advanceth Gods glory cannot be charged as a sin, But covenant-breaking with God, (according to the Apostle) addes to his glory, and therefore it cannot be charged as a sin: If answer be made, that this exaltation of God in his glory is by accident, and no thanks to him that breaks covenant, but to the goodnes of God that brings good out of evill: From this, inference is made also, *Let us then do evill that good may come*, which Conclusion was slanderously charged upon the Apostle, *Rom.* 3. vers. 8. The doctrine of Gods free election of some, and passing by of others, occasioned two desperate inferences; 1. *That there is then unrighteousnes with God*, as deserting, yea hating his creature without cause, *Rom.* 9. 14. 2. That God

then without reaſon finds a fault with his creature, this being his will, who can reſiſt it? *Ro.* 9. 19. The wits of ſome have been indeed buſied to put ſuch a comment upon the Apoſtles words, that no ſuch inference as theſe, with any colour, or ſhew of reaſon, can be drawn: and thereby make it appear that their comment is utterly diſſonant from the Text; for from the Apoſtles doctrine, theſe inferences, in the judgement of blinded reaſon, and rules held between creature and creature, ſeem directly to follow, as evidently appears in the Apoſtles anſwer. To come nearer to the buſineſs in hand, the Apoſtle making it his work to advance Gods free grace in mans juſtification, ſome feared leſt their ſin was above the grace of a pardon: To ſatisfie theſe, the Apoſtle tels them, that where ſin abounded, grace doth ſuper-abound, *Rom.* 5. 20. So that the greatneſs of their ſin exalts the free grace and favour of God: an inference is preſently ready, *Let us then continue in ſin, that grace may abound*, Rom. 6. 1. And here indeed was as fair and full encouragement to ſin, as any that you hold out, in your objection againſt this doctrine; this very uſe which you ſay is now made by wicked ones, of this Doctrine, generally taught by Proteſtants, was made (as is ſaid) in the Apoſtles times, by the Gnoſticks and others, who maintained, that it was enough to believe that Chriſt died for ſin, though a man liv'd in all wickedneſs and ungodlineſs. How could this ſo ſoon ſpring in the Church, but that carnal ones found ſome-what that would bear ſome colour on which they might bottom it? as, *omne mendacium fundatur in aliquâ veritate*, as may be ſeen verified in the inſtances mentioned. Let not Chriſtian doctrin then be blamed upon the account of ſuch deſperate deductions, and curſedly wreſted inferences. As ſoon as reformation began, and this doctrine among others appeared, it is well known what from the adverſaries it ſuffered. As it was laid to the Reformers charge, that they made *God the author of ſin*, ſo that *Gibieuf* with his black mouth, makes *Calvin* worſe then the *Manichees*: ſo alſo that they utterly laid aſide all care and regard of good works, or wayes of godlineſs, and that upon account of their doctrine, that *faith alone juſtifies*. It is well known with what a belly they uſe to picture *Luther*, as if his work had been alone to drink. And *Bellarmine* taking upon him in the preface to his fourth Tome, out of the *Revelation*, to ſet out what a creature a

Lutheran

Lutheran is, saith, *that those that are addicted to their belly for the most part fall to them.* And their orator, *Turner*, in his elogie of Drunkennesse, applauds the Lutherans with a *bene feciſtis*, in that they have left the Catholique Church, to betake themselves to that party. How full their invectives were against *Calvin* and *Beza*, and all of their opinion, as enemies of all godlinesse, and friends of prophanesse, almost all books of popish writers may witnesse. Those things are famous that *Bellarmine* out of *Bolsecke* and *Colcheus* quotes to this purpose. *Granatensis* in his dedicatory Epistle before his *Dux peccatorum*, having laid this down as a maxime, that *Holinesse and purity of doctrine is a certain mark and note of true faith and Religion*, and asserted, that there hath been no sect from the beginning of the world, if we run through all ages, to be compared with Christians, for doctrine of concernment to mans Moral conversation; he enters comparison, first, with *Heathenism*, then with *Turcisme*, then with *Judaisme* after Christs comming, and lastly takes notice of the lives of *Hereticks* in the primitive times; of the *Manichees* out of *Austin*, Of the *Gnosticks* out of *Epiphanius*, Of the *Carpocratians* out of *Austin*, then he fals upon his own times, and saies, *The Heretiques of our own times are no more holy. They that have fetch'd back the errors of faith of former Heretiques from hell, are also diligent followers of their practices; what holinesse of life*, saith he, *is to be expected from the Lutherans, that with their speciall faith have set open a door to all impiety? and the wicked practices of the Calviniſts are better known*, saith he, *then we desire:* and thereupon tels us two tales, first, that some that neighbour upon *Geneva*, being demanded, why they did not reject the Catholique, and receive *Genevas* Gospel, answered, *That was not to be wondered at, for said they, the words and books of Calviniſts, stuff'd with lies and fraud, are carried further then the narrative of their wickednesse; But to us (say they) that go every week to their Market, it is well known to be a kingdome of hellish confusion, and therefore their Gospell doth not take with us.* His next is, of a *certain Minister of theirs, who a few years before went into* Hungary, *& petitioned a Bashaw of the Turks for liberty to preach their Gospel to the Christians that lived among the Turks under tribute; and to perswade the said Bashaw to grant his Petition, he began with many reasons to tell him, that the Religion of the Calviniſts was most near to that of* Mahomet. *And having ended*

his

his request, the said Bashaw *answered, I see that you Calvinists and we are like to be shortly one, Save only that leaving the drinking of water to us, you willl keep your selves to wine, and be drunk with it.* Charges of this nature, *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* were wont still to hear, but divine providence, through grace, hath so ordered, that these Calumnies, as with a beam of the Sun, have been dispelled. The holy lives of those that appeared for this doctrine hath been an abundant reall confutation. Not to look beyond the seas where we might be furnished with severall instances, let *Jewel, Grindall, Pilkington, Raynolds, Fulk, Whitaker, Perkins, Fox, Greenewood, Dod, Hilderson, Pemble, Ball,* and many others, with their Followers, witnesse. In so much, that by degrees, shame hath caused them to forbear this Language: And as for those who of latter times have receded from this doctrine of this supposed danger (as *Mountague* and his followers, as may be seen in his *Gagg,* and *Appeal*) whether their lives and zeal for the Gospel did at all outstrip those already mentioned, whose supposed errors in doctrine they went about to correct, I leave to all of impartiall judgement to witnesse. How great a trouble is it then to have this, by a man of your name and reputation, now revived? For that experience of yours, of which we have already heard, and you further enlarge, in your affirming that *you never met with the most rebellious wretch (except now and then one under terrors) but when they have sinn'd their worst, they still think to be saved, because they believe; and what is their believing? why they believe that Christ died for them, and therefore God will forgive them, and they trust for pardon and salvation from Christ's death and Gods mercy.*

The assertion (that faith in Christ's blood is the only justifying act) acquit from danger.

To this I answer: Though I do not in any other thing appear in competition with you, yet here I may say, my experience hath been of a longer standing then yours, yet I can say, it answers not that which you here mention. When I have to deal with such that you name, if they look out of themselves at all, it is usually to Gods mercy. He is, say they, a mercifull God, and at what time soever a sinner repenteth from the bottom of his heart, he is ready to receive, and so relying on Gods mercy, they will take their time for their return. Which is answered also, as is evident in the experience of others. Read Practical Treatises, and publish'd Sermons, and see whether this plea be not commonly spoken to: Ordinarily their answer is, that their

good

good doings, their Prayers, and Repentance, must save them. Few comparatively will have Christ in their mouths, till he be put into their heads. And if they hit upon *faith*, as sometimes they will, they yet know not how to terminate it on Christ's blood. It is only a good belief, that God will not deal so with them. Such a faith the Plain mans path-way to heaven, out of much experience of such mens answers, doth notably decipher. It is a rare thing to meet with one that will argue as you would put it into their mouths, *viz. He that hath the only justifying act of faith is justified: But that have I; For I accept of Christ to forgive and justifie me by his blood: Therefore I am justified.* But in case any shall thus reason, you say you are not able to answer, and I shall not presume to be your teacher. But me thinks you might deign to learn of Mr. *Gataker*, and tell such a disputant, that it is not every thing that bears the name of faith, that is an acceptation of Christ to justification. You may acquaint him, that there is a true and sincere faith, and that there is a false and counterfeit faith; and that it is not enough for justification to say, that a man hath faith, but soundly and sincerely to believe. If he say, that his faith is not dissembled, but sincere, put him upon that which Mr. *Gataker* sayes, is Saint *James* his way of tryall, If he will have faith to justifie his person, let works then justifie his faith. There is life in that faith that takes Christ's blood for justification, and that faith that hath life to take, hath life also to work. Where a receiving or taking faith is, there Christ is, and where Christ is, the soul can do all things through Christ that strengthens. So that if the man be such as you speak, his faith is cast, at the first sight, and evidenced to be no better then counterfeit, and is no *medium* to justification. He may talk that Christ is his, but it is clear that it is on a crackt title: and his faith being no better then you say, had he all the Logick in the world, here he must be *non pluss'd*. And here I would willingly learn how you will convince such a man of whom you here speak, upon your own principles. If he shall argue, He that hath the onely justifying act of faith is justified: but that have I; for I take Christ as my Saviour, and Soveraign Lord: *Ergo*. Seeing there are many that profess to take Christ for a Lord, as well as a Saviour, that must never enter into the kingdome of heaven, *Mat.* 7. 21. *If* they do not spit at Christ and defie him, they perswade themselves that

that they ſerve him. A ſervice of Jeſus Chriſt, with their own moſt favourable and eaſie comment upon it, they doubt not will ſave them. And *I* know no viler perſons in the world, then thoſe that ſay, that they love and ſerve Chriſt with all their heart, and that their good works and ſerving of God muſt keep them from hell and damnation: As *I* once heard a man ſtark drunk on a Lords-day profeſs, that fall back, fall edge, he would never leave ſerving God whilſt he lived. Theſe, if they may be believed, have as good an heart to God, as he that is moſt preciſe in all the world. And if they be wanting in that acuteneſs of Logick that you before mention, they may be wel holpen, out of your principles, which they may find anon, thus to reaſon. He that fals ſhort of the precepts of the Law, and requiſites in the Goſpel, may yet be juſtified and ſaved, if he anſwers to the conditions of the Goſpel-covenant: But thus do *I*: although *I* come not is to the precepts of the Law, not to what is required in the Goſpel, yet *I* anſwer to the conditions of it, for according to you, theſe come ſhort both of the commands of the Law, and the precepts of the Goſpell. Though they do not all that is commanded them neither in Law nor Goſpell, yet they hope they do that which will ſave them. They have their faults, they confeſs, and who, ſay they, is free? Few dayes paſs over their heads, but they ſay, God forgive me. What you ſay is their wickedneſs, they will ſay is innocent and praiſe worthy; I never knew a more vile wretch then one that would ſay, that he thought in conſcience he ſerved God better on a *Sunday*, ſpending ſix pence in an Ale-houſe to help a poor woman with her children to live, then in going to Church, when his own wife and children ſtood in as much need, as any Ale-wive's whoſoever. Look among Papiſts, who look upon works, not only as ſuch that juſtifie, but alſo merit, and ſuper-erogate, and ſee how far they exceed thoſe that hold this, which you call ſo dangerous a principle. They are Saints here, they ſay, compar'd with thoſe in *Italy* and *Spain*; this being the place of their perſecution: Yet Doctor *Hall* obſerves in his ſerious diſſwaſive from Popery, that he never yet could know that Papiſt, which made conſcience of all Gods ten morall Lawes: ſo that in leaving our principles to chooſe theirs, upon a deſign to advance good works, you much miſtake your way, and go about to work with a wrong engine. And I can con-

clude

clude no other, but that theſe inferences are without reaſon, and that there is no Goſpel-principle that can be laid down, but men may alike wreſt to their own perdition.

SECT. II.

Mans Evangelicall, Perſonall Righteouſneſs, is not here perfect.

THe next in order which you examine, is, concerning the inſtrumentality of faith in Juſtification, which is already ſpoke to and inſerted into the body of the Treatiſe: and therefore I paſs to your third, to which you ſpeak, Sect. 28. pag. 41 entituling it, *Of Evangelicall, perſonall Righteouſneſs*: Where you ſet down words of mine at large; and then ſubjoyn; *The third opinion which you riſe againſt, is, that which you take to be mine, as your citing my words doth manifeſt.* Where I do not then cite any words which are yours, nor uſe your name, I pray you, let me not hear any ſuch charge. I am loath to cauſe this piece to ſwell with repetition of all my own words. That which I excepted againſt, was, [That our perſonall inherent righteouſneſs is affirmed to be perfect] and [a charge of intolerable ignorance laid upon learned men that ſpeak otherwiſe.] Here, I partly implyed, and partly expreſt ſeveral conceſſions, which you take hold of, and raiſe ſeveral queſtions about them. 1. I yield [a righteouſneſs of this kind *inherent* in Chriſtians, though I deny ſuch a *perfection*] as I take to be aſſerted in your Treatiſe. And here you think, *I* am already caught. For *ens* and *perfectum*, are, ſay you, as convertible, as *ens* and *bonum*, or *ens* and *verum*. And after pains taken out of *Scheibler*, and *Scaliger* to correct my ignorance, you tell me, *It is a Metaphyſicall, Tranſcendentall perfection that you ſpeak of, which hath no contrary in being, which conſiſteth in the preſence of all things neceſſary to being*, &c. And you warn me ſtill to remember, *that you take it not*, de perfectione accidentali *but* eſſentiali. And *I* wiſh that you had told your Reader ſo: *I* am confident there was not one that did ſo underſtand you in your Aphoriſms. When we diſpute, whether ſuch, or ſuch a thing be perfect, or imperfect,

The authors conceſſions vindicated.

we take it for granted, that there is such a possible imperfection, of which we dispute. If *I* dispute the truth of this proposition, *Cœlum movetur ab intelligentiis*, *I* do not question whether this be truly a proposition; but whether in the common acceptation, it be logically true; whether the predicate be truly affirm'd of the subject. Did not you speak of righteousness, and so of holiness, as it denominateth the subject? not as an abstract, but a concrete, and so susceptible of *magis* and *minus*, (if Qualities do *suscipere magis* and *minus*,) and such as is subject to contrarieties? When learned divines have spoke in your hearing, (as you imply that they have done,) of imperfect righteousness, can you think that it was in their heads to take it in that sense, in which a little learning might acquaint them, that there is no possible imperfection? 2. *I* further yielded [*a perfection of the subject*, as opposed to hypocrisie, dissimulation, or doubleness, and *a perfection of the entireness of the object*, respecting, not one, or only some, but all commandments, called a perfection of parts.] This you say, you do not understand, though *I* think, few other Readers have been so quick, as to discern any difficulty. When Divines speak of universall obedience grounding their words on severall Scripture-Texts, do not they ordinarily explain themselves, 1. Of an universality of the Subject? when the whole man is brought into obedience, according to that of the Apostle, 1 *Thes.* 5. 23. *The very God of peace sanctifie you* [*wholly*] per omnia perfectos, *Vatablus* reads it, and puts in the margent, *vel totos*, according to our reading, *wholly*: And then adds his comment, *The following words declare what that* [*wholly*] *is*, viz. *in soul, in spirit, and body*. This is the perfection of the subject of which *I* spake, and as *I* thought, sufficiently explain'd my self. 2. Of an universality of the Object, when not one, but every command is heeded, as *Psal.* 119. 6, 128. You tell me, *you charitably conjecture, that when I speak of a perfection of the object, I mean a perfection of our acts, as they respect the object extensively*. And if you please but to make use of your eyes, they will inform you, that nothing else can be my meaning, and so *I* shall not stand in need of your charity in it. And hereupon you fall to distinguish of objects, *I* know not why, but that *I* may know, (which *I* well knew before) that you can distinguish. You tell us of objects of *absolute necessity*, and objects of *less necessity*. For answer

Vel totos, sequentia declarant istud totos: hoc est in spiritu & in anima & in corpore.

ſwer to which, it is enough for me, that there is ſuch an entire nels in the ſoul, reſpective to all known obliging commandements, that denominates the man in an Evangelical ſenſe, univerſal and entire in his obedience.

After a large diſcourſe to ſhew how our righteouſneſſe is eſſentially perfect, you ſeem thus to ſumme up all, *pag.* 43. *Take up all together then, and you will ſee, that,* 1. *Righteouſneſſe is formally a relation,* 2. *And that not of our actions or diſpoſitions to the meer precept of the Law, determining of duty as ſuch (Commonly called the Morall law) but* 1. *To the law as determining of the condition of life or death,* 2. *To the promiſe and threatning of that Law which are joyned to the condition.* But you ſhould conſider, that we are talking of a *Rule*, without conſideration either of reward or puniſhment, and you runne out into a diſcourſe of a *Covenant*. The query is, *Whether righteouſneſſe be perfect* or *imperfect*: You fall upon it, *as a condition of Juſtification*, which never was put to queſtion. And you well know, that thoſe learned men whoſe ignorance you thus challenge, never had any ſuch thing in their thoughts, Making the Scripture their ſtudy, and *Proteſtants* writers their Comment, they find Juſtification by the blood of Chriſt, *Rom.* 5.9 and intereſt in this blood alone by faith, *Rom.* 3 25,28. and works they find again and again excluded. I wiſh you to conſult the Homilies of the Church of *England*, eſpecially the Homilies of the Salvation of Man-kind by Chriſt our Saviour, pag. 14. Having touched upon divers paſſages of Saint *Paul*, This is added, *In the aforeſaid places the Apoſtle toucheth eſpecially three things which muſt go together in our Juſtifycation, upon Gods part, his great mercy and grace; upon Chriſts part, Juſtice, that is, the ſatisfaction of Gods Juſtice, or the price of our Redemtion, by the offering of his body, & ſhedding of his blood, with the fulfilling of the Law perfectly and throughly; and upon our part, true and lively faith in the merits of* Jeſus Chriſt —— *And therefore Saint* Paul *declareth here nothing upon the behalf of man, concerning his Juſtification, but only a true and lively faith. And yet that faith doth not ſhut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God to be joyned with faith in every man that is Juſtified, but it ſhutteth them out from the office of Juſtifying*, With much more to the ſame purpoſe. Your Readers that are not ſo much ſeen in the Language of *Bellarmine*, and *Suarez*, as they are in the Scriptures,

or at leaſt, that do not ſo much heed them, deny all that you take for granted. In which alſo you have phraſes more uncouth to your Readers, then any that I have uttered can be to you; *to be righteous ſignifieth*, ſay you, *quoad legem novam, non obligatus ad pœnam, & cui debetur præmium.* This ſignification, according to this new law, I think was never found in any of our old and new Dictionaries. Thoſe that are righteous ſhall be thus acquit, and rewarded, we believe, but not upon account of any righteouſneſſe inherent in them, but the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt made theirs by faith: and ſo their faith is accounted to them for righteouſneſſe. You then adde, *So that you ſee that your firſt righteouſneſſe [non reatus pœnæ, vel jus ad impunitatem & ad præmium] as it requires Chriſts perfect ſatisfaction as a* medium *to it, by which all the charge of the Law works muſt be anſwered; So it requires our performance of the condition of the Law of grace, as an other* medium, *by which Chriſt and his benefits are made ours.* I had thought that our righteouſneſſe had not been *non reatus pœnæ* that is not the thing, at beſt, were it as perfect as *Adams* was, but rather *non reatus culpæ.* If a man be charged with Murther, his righteouſneſſe as to this charge, is, his not-killing, and not his non-obligation to the Gibbet, That follows upon it; *non reatus*, is not of the eſſence of righteouſneſſe, nor is *reatus* of the eſſence of ſin, otherwiſe then *conſecutivè.* And that Chriſts righteouſneſſe ſhould be thus called a *medium*, I do not ſee. I think it is the thing it ſelf, and not a *medium* to it. And that our righteouſneſſe is any *medium* to Juſtification as it is inherent, I deny: and that our inherent righteouſneſſe required by the Law of Grace, ſtands in any ſuch ſubordination to the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, as a neceſſary means to make it ours, I ſee your word for it, but I think (and the reformed Churches are of the ſame mind) that I have the whole current of Scripture againſt it. You cloſe up this diſcourſe thus; *And thus I have done what at preſent I thought my duty, that it might be not my fault, that you are in ignorance all over; But I have ſaid the leſſe, becauſe I have lately more exactly opened the nature of our righteouſneſſe, in anſwer to the Animadverſions of an other learned brother.* But it is worth inquiry whether this learned Brother have received ſatisfaction from that more exact paines of yours. Perhaps his learning may ſerve to give as exact an anſwer. And if his greater

learning

learning be not ſatisfyed with that which is more exact and elaborate, my leſs learning may well remain as much unſatisfied with leſſe exactneſſe. And your Reader will think you were not ſo well adviſed, to publiſh your ſelf, and conceal your moſt exact opening of this poynt of ſo great concernement. Though you might think, that any thing might ſerve me, yet all your exactneſſe will, I believe, be litte enough in this poynt to give ſatisfaction to many Readers.

Whereas you had ſaid in your Aphoriſmes, *pag.* 122. *Imperfect righteouſneſſe, is not righteouſneſſe, but unrighteouſneſſe. It is a contradiction:* in adjecto; yet there admitting an imperfection in holineſſe, I anſwer'd, [I never took imperfect righteouſneſſe to imply any ſuch contradiction, more then imperfect holineſſe] To this you reply, 1. By a way of conceſſion, *that holineſſe is taken, firſt, for the relation of a perſon [or thing dedicated to God, So it admits not of* magis *and* minus *more then righteouſneſſe*; 2. *That the common uſe of the word, Holineſſe, is for the qualities or actions of a ſpiritually-renewed man,* & this is confeſſed to have its *tranſcendent perfection, as wel as righteouſneſs.* Hitherto we are agreed; *but here,* ſay you, *is the difference, Holineſſe thus taken is a quality, which though it have the truth of being, yet it is intendend and remitted or doth* recipere *magis & minus righteouſnes is a relation which in* ſuo formali *is not intended or remitted.* And is not Righteouſneſſe a quality in like manner, which is intended and remitted? when *Zachary* ſaies, *We are delivered out of the hands of all our enemies, to ſerve in righteouſneſſe and true holineſſe,* Is not the one a qualification by a new work of the Spirit, as well as the other? When the Angel ſaid, *Rev.* 22. *He that is unjuſt, let him be unjuſt ſtill; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy ſtill; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous ſtill; and he that is holy, let him be holy ſtill*: As [unjuſt] and [filthy] hold out vicious qualities from the fleſh, ſo [Holy] and [righteous] both ſignifie renewed qualities by the Spirit. It follows, *Nay if you will exactly open it, it will appear that the righteouſneſſe in queſtion is a relation founded in a relation. Yea more, that the very* ſubjectum proximum hujus relationis nec intenditur, nec remittitur, *& this is that I mean by perfection, beſides the aforeſaid tranſcendent all perfection.* And how ſhall we know what the righteouſnes in queſtion is? either it muſt be gathered out of your own words, or out of their words, that you

Imperfect righteouſneſſe is no contradiction.

Righteouſneſs as well as holineſs is intended and remitted.

cenſure as guilty of ſuch ignorance, as before; Let us look upon your own words, *Theſſ.* 2.2. which you there comment upon. *In this fore-explained ſenſe, it is that men in Scripture,* (ſay you) *are ſaid to be perſonally righteous: And in this ſenſe it is, that the faith and duties of believers, are ſaid to pleaſe God,* viz. *as they are related to the covenant of Grace, and not as they are meaſur'd by the Covenant of works.* Are not [faith] and [duties] here our perſonall righteouſneſſe? and is not [faith] a branch of holineſſe as well as it is of righteouſneſſe? And hath it not its degrees as well as righteouſneſs? Surely the Apoſtles thought ſo when they prayed, *Lord increaſe our faith,* Luk. 17.5. And the Lord Chriſt had no other thoughts, when he rebukes his hearers for their *little faith,* Matth. 6.30. And commends the Woman of *Canaan* for the *greatneſſe of her faith,* Matth. 15.28. And as it riſeth and falls, ſo do other duties with it: they are more intenſe, or remiſſe, in like manner. And as for their ſpeeches which you challenge; do you think that their ignorance was in that meaſure intolerable, as to believe the righteouſneſſe of what they ſpake was a meer non-entity, *i.e.* had nothing of the being of righteouſneſſe in it? They doubtleſſe looked upon righteouſneſſe as a renewed quality, as you do upon holineſſe, and the Apoſtle, both upon *holineſſe* and *righteouſneſſe*, Eph. 4. 24. The new man is ſo put on that we muſt be ſtill putting it on. It follows, that ſeeing *theſe things are* exactioris indigationis, *underſtand that the reaſon of my aſſertion lyes here: The law as it is the rule of obedience, doth require perfect obedience in degree, and ſo here is an imperfection in our actions in the degree, as being ſhort of what the rule requireth, and it being theſe actions with their habits which we call our holineſſe, therefore we muſt needs ſay, our holineſſe is imperfect. And if our righteouſneſſe were to be denominated from this law, commanding perfection, we muſt ſay, not that ſuch righteouſneſſe were imperfect, becauſe the holineſſe or obedience is imperfect, but it is none at all, becauſe they are imperfect.* It ſeems you intend here, exactneſſe equall to that in which you appeared to the learned brother before mentioned; and as you did diſtinguiſh before of a *metaphyſicall* and *morall* perfection, ſo you ſeem here to diſtinguiſh of righteouſneſſe and holineſſe: either as a *duty* performed by men in the Covenant of grace according to rule; or elſe as a *condition* required by the Covenant of works, reſpective to the attainment of life

upon

upon terms there required. This ſeems to be your meaning in your laſt words in this Paragraph: *Duty ſimply as duty, and holineſs or ſupernaturall grace as ſuch may be more or leſs; But holineſs and duty, as the* materia requiſita, vel ſubjectum proximum juſtitiæ, conſiſtit in indivisibili. How duty and holineſs can be the ſubject of it ſelf, I know not; for ſo they are, if they be the ſubjects of righteouſneſs. That righteouſneſs in which we muſt exceed the righteouſneſs of Scribes and Phariſees is our duty, and our holineſs as well as of our righteouſneſs; but if you carry it thence to make it the righteouſneſs of the covenant of works, it is eaſily granted, that the imperfection of it, renders it as no righteouſneſs reſpective to that end of attainment of life by it. A Phariſee might as well be juſtified upon the terms of that covenant, as *Noah*, *Daniel*, and *Job*, *Zachary*, and *Elizabeth*, or any other of thoſe, that were moſt perfect and eminent in righteouſneſs. But I think, no Reader could obſerve either in your own words, or theirs that you cenſure, any ſuch meaning.

To aſſert the imperfection of our righteouſneſs *I* ſaid, [*Iſaiah*, *I* am ſure, ſaith, All our righteouſneſſes are as filthy rags, *Iſ.* 64. 6. no greater charge of imperfection can lie againſt the moſt imperfect holineſs, then the Prophet layes upon our righteouſneſs, I interpreting the Prophets words, as *I* think the ſenſe of them is generally given by interpreters ancient and modern. But ſeeing you go off to ſpeak of righteouſneſs of another kind, *I* will not contend. *I* there added, [Neither do *I* underſtand how holineſs ſhould be imperfect, taken materially, and righteouſneſs perfect, taken formally in reference to a rule.] After ſuch courteous cenſure that you pleaſe to give, you fall to examine what that is, that *I* underſtand not. In which you take one piece of my ſentence apart, and ſay, [How holineſs ſhould be imperfect, taken materially,] *ſure you underſtand that: It is therefore*, ſay you, *no doubt, the other branch that you mean, How righteouſneſs is perfect taken formally in reference to a rule.* If the Reader pleaſe to conſult my words, he may ſee that *I* put them not *diviſim*, but *conjunctim*, giving in my reaſon, why to me it is non-intelligible, telling you that [we may for ought *I* know, as well make holineſs *formall*, and refer it to a rule, and righteouſneſs *materiall*, in an abſolute conſideration, without reference to any rule at all.] This you disjoyn from the reſt, and

and fall upon my words apart; for what reaſon, is beſt known to your ſelf; And *I* leave it to the Reader to judge, whether that *I* may not call holineſs perfect, and righteouſneſs imperfect, as well as you may call righteouſneſs perfect, and holineſs imperfect; and whether there is not a materiality, and formality, (not in the one, or the other)) but in the one, as well as the other: and this was that which *I* ſpake to. And any man that underſtands no more then *I*, will (*I* think) take this to be a material exception againſt that which in your Aphoriſmes was delivered. You ſay, *if you, or any man reſolve to uſe holineſs in the ſame ſenſe as righteouſneſs, if I once know your minds, I will not contradict you, for I find no pleaſure in contending about words, but for my ſelf, I muſt uſe them in the common ſenſe, if I will be underſtood.* But you might have done well to let us know that, that is the common ſenſe of the word *righteouſneſs*, (taken for perſonall inherent righteouſneſs) which you here uſe; till *I* ſee that made good, *I* ſhall judge it to be your own peculiar acceptation of it. *I* would know what interpreter of *Zachary's* words, *Luk.* 1.75. of *Paul's* words, *Eph.* 4. 24. of *John's* words, *Revel.* 22. 11. do put ſuch a differenee as you make between *righteouſneſs*, & *holineſs*, as to make one a renewed quality of the Spirit, the other no ſuch thing, but a relation *in eſſe formali*, to what you muſt explain your ſelf; I have read ſo much difference indeed made, as to put holineſs for duties of the firſt Table, in immediate reference to God; righteouſneſs for duties of the ſecond Table, in immediate concernment to man: but thus taken, they are both equally new qualities from the Spirit, and have their intenſion and remiſſion, one, as well as the other. And I have read a rule given, that where they are put together (as in the Scriptures quoted) they are to be diſtinguiſhed as before, but where the one is put apart, it is to be underſtood as comprehenſive of both. It were eaſie to ſhew, that writers of moſt eminent name promiſcuouſly uſe theſe terms of righteouſneſs and holineſs. But for your interpretation, for ought I know, you are alone in it, ſpeaking as you do, and entituling your diſcourſe of perſonal inherent righteouſneſs. I added, [And in ſuch conſideration (*viz.* without any reference to any rule at all) I do not know how there can be perfection, or imperfection, (either in holineſs, or righteouſneſs: *Is* is as it they come up to,) or fall ſhort of the rule, that they have the de-

Righteouſneſs and holineſs in what ſenſe commonly uſed.

Moral perfection, or imperfection is in reference to a rule.

no-

nomination of perfection, or imperfection.] To this you ſay, *At the firſt view the ſentence ſeem'd ſo ſtrange to me, that I thought it meeteſt to ſay nothing, becauſe it is ſcarce capable of any apt anſwer, but what will ſeem ſharp, or unmannerly:* Now you have found out a way to ſpeak, both mildly and mannerly, you think, (it ſeems) that your words will be more heeded, then at other times. You further ſay, *That which I ſay you may conſider, is ſomething, or nothing: if ſomething, and yet not capable of perfection, or imperfection, it is ſuch a ſomething, as the world never heard of till now.* I had thought, on the contrary, that there is many a thing in the world, (& I believe ſhall think, when you have ſpoke all that you can againſt it) capable neither of morall perfection, or imperfection, and of ſuch perfection we ſpeak, when we ſpeak of inherent perſonall righteouſneſs, and therefore uncapable either of perfection, or imperfection, becauſe there is no rule by which they are meaſured. The Schoolmen, you know, ſpeak of actions preventing reaſon, which they ſay are actions *of men*, but deny them properly to be actions *humane*, as you may ſee in *Thom.* 1, 2. *quæſt.* 1. *art.* 1, 2. as to move the foot, rub the beard, when a mans thoughts are intent on ſomewhat elſe. Theſe, they uſe to ſay have neither rectitude, nor irrectitude in them, are neither good, nor evil, and therefore neither perfect, nor imperfect. But if all actions of men muſt be alſo humane, and ſuch that reaſon orders according to rule, or at leaſt ought to order, and are therefore either right or oblique, as ſome in oppoſition to Schoolmen do determine; yet doubtleſs it is not ſo in the actions of brute creatures: Theſe have neither morall perfection, nor imperfection, ſeeing they act by no rule, ſave that of natures inſtinct. And if all rule were taken from man, his actions would be parallel. Where there is no Law, there is no tranſgreſſion, and conſequently no conformity, nor inconformity, no rectitude, nor irrectitude, and ſo neither perfection, nor imperfection. You adde, *But upon ſecond thoughts, I find that your words, de juſtitiâ may be born, for it is nothing that you ſpeak of.* This I think is ſuch an anſwer, that few will ſee either mildneſs, or manners in it. I ſpeak of mans perſonall righteouſneſs, and ſo do you: This you affirm to be perfect, and charge learned Divines, as before, for charging it with imperfection. And if it be nothing, you might well have kept ſilence, for [nothing] ſuf-

fers nothing by their language. That which follows, muſt at leaſt be repeated : *But that holineſs taken for ſpirituall habits and acts, can have neither perfection or imperfection; or that, that they are capable of no perfection, or imperfection, in any other ſenſe, but as related; nor yet in any relations to God, or the perſon dedicating, ſave only in relation to the Rule; all theſe for the firſt reaſon, ſhall have no anſwer but a recitall.* I might ſay of much that is here repeated, *Tu male dum repetis, incipit eſſe tuus.* And I think that which you now repeat, is not ſuch that you may ſay, *magnâ fronte recitâſſe, eſt refutaſſe.* To this ſupercilious reply, I only ſay; that this is the firſt time that ever I heard of holineſs of *ſeparation, dedication,* or *relation,* applied to acts, or habits of this nature. And what elſe, but the reference to the rule, can denominate them imperfect, I would you had ſpoke out. They are ſinfull only, according as they tranſgreſs the rule, and righteous as they hold to it, and by conſequence, *I* think that they are either perfect, or imperfect, on like account.

I added in my Treatiſe; [*Pauls* Goſpell frame, whether you will call it righteouſneſs, or holineſs, is ſet out *I* am ſure, *Rom.* 7. full of imperfection, yet all this as in reference to the rule, as it anſwered, or fell ſhort in conformity to it, *v.* 22. *I delight in the Law of God after the inner man.*] Here you begin to quarrel with the phraſe, and ſay, *Is not* [*righteouſneſs*] *or* [*holineſs*] *as Scripturall, as Logicall, as plain a term, & as fit for diſputants as* [*Goſpel frame?*] *I* anſwer, yes doubtleſs, when they are uſed Scripturally, or Logically: but when your Reader is confounded with the uſe of theſe terms, making one imperfect, and the other uncapable of any imperfection; making one to ſtand in conformity to a rule, the other without any ſuch conformity at all; taking one Metaphyſically, and not telling us how you take the other: ſometimes telling us that you take *holineſs* for the qualities, and actions of a ſpiriturally renewed man, elſe-where, that it ſignifies no more then a dedication to God, either by ſeparation onely, or, by qualifying the ſubject; firſt, with an aptitude to it's divine employment, and then ſeparating, or devoting it, *I* was put upon it, to ſeek a third word, to hold out that which *I* mean by righteouſneſs, and holineſs; and learned men mean, when they ſpeak of imperfect righteouſneſs, which alſo is the ſame with your

qualities

qualities, or actions of a ſpiritually renewed man. You further ſay, *Till I further know whether by* [*Goſpel-frame*] *you mean, Habits, Acts, Relations, (and what Relations) or what elſe, I ſhall paſs it, as uncapable of a better reply.* Adding further, *Did not I acknowledge expreſly as much imperfection, as you here affirm, of* Pauls *frame; why then do you intimate by your arguing, as if I did not? Anſw.* If you did expreſly make ſuch acknowledgement, ſurely you knew what you meant, when you did expreſly acknowledge it, and how is it then that you are ſo to ſeek in my meaning? you tell me further, *There is a twofold rule, or action of the Law; which our habits, and actions do reſpect, as you ſay, you have oft ſaid. The firſt is the precept determining the duty ſimply; this, all our habits, and actions, come ſhort of, and therefore no man hath righteouſneſs conſiſting in this conformity. The ſecond is the promiſe, or that act going along with the promiſe, whereby God determineth of the condition.* To this *I* ſay, *If I* had ſpoken of [action of Law,] and confounded [rule] and [action] together, I ſhould have heard of it. And if you have often ſaid, that there is ſuch a twofold rule, *I* think no other man, but your ſelf, hath ſaid it, and *I* neither hear of Scripture, nor reaſon for it. We are ſpeaking of *agenda*, and not *credenda*; and that here ſhould be any rule *de agendis*, but the precept determining of duty, or that the promiſe, or any act that goes along with the promiſe (which what it means, *I* cannot imagine) ſhould be any rule of our actions, *I* never heard, but from your mouth. And for your inference, *That all our Actions and Habits, comming ſhort of the precept, determining of duty, no man therefore hath a righteouſneſs conſiſting in this conformity*, *I* ſhould think, all but your ſelf, would take to be a *Non ſequitur*. There is a righteouſneſs in conformity to the precept, which yet fals ſhort of a full and perfect conformity. Look *I* pray you upon *Zacharie*, and *Elizabeth*; that have this praiſe in the Goſpel, that *they were both righteous before God*, and by what rule this righteouſneſs had its denomination, let the Text be conſulted. If *walking in all the ordinances*, and *commandements of God blameleſs*, give men the denomination of righteouſneſs, then there is a righteouſneſs in conformity to the precept? But walking in all the commandments, and ordinances of God, denominates men righteous; *Ergo*, doing righteouſneſs denominates righteous; *He that*

There is a righteouſneſs, in an imperfect conformity to the Law.

doth righteouſneſs, is righteous, 1 *John* 4. 7. And what ſhould be the rule of doing, but the precept, I cannot imagine: If we break the precept when we ſin, the precept is our rule; but we break the precept when we ſin, 1 *John* 5. 4. *Abel* hath often that Teſtimony to be *righteous*, and that becauſe his works were *righteous*, 1 John 3. 12. And ſo *Lot*, in like manner, 2 *Pet.* 2. 8. there is a righteouſneſs then in conformity to the Law of works, though not to the covenant of works. *Zachary* ſaies, *We are redeemed to ſerve without fear, in holineſs and righteouſneſs before God*, Luk. 1. 74, 75. And this *righteouſneſs*, is not without its rule, and hath no other rule then that which *Zacharies righteouſneſs* had, in the ſixth verſe of the ſame Chapter. There is an imperfect fulfilling of the Law; and ſo an imperfect righteouſneſs in conformity to it. (*b*) *We grant* (ſaith *Davenant*) *that the regenerate love God, and their neighbour, but they love imperfectly, and by conſequence they fulfil the Law imperfectly*, de Juſtit. actuali, *p.* 551. And if you acknowledge an imperfection in *Pauls* frame, (as you ſay, you do,) you then acknowledge an imperfect fulfilling of the Law, and an imperfect conformity to the Law. It is in reference to the Law, that he had his imperfections, and gradual inconformity. *He delights*, he ſaies, *in the Law, in the inward man*, but ſees an oppoſite power, drawing him aſide, and he quotes the precept, and not the promiſe annex'd, *Thou ſhalt not covet*, to which in ſuch imperfection he conformed.

B. *concedimus renatos diligere deum & proximum; ſed imperfectè diligere, & per conſequens imperfectè legem implere.*

I added in my Treatiſe, [Whereas a charge of ignorance is laid even upon learned Teachers, that commonly underſtand the word [Righteouſneſs] and [Righteous] as it refers to the old Rule, I profeſs my ſelf to have little of their learning, but I am wholly theirs in this ignorance. I know no other Rule, but the old Rule, the Rule of the Moral Law, that is with me a Rule, a perfect Rule, and the only Rule.] Here you firſt complain of want of candor in me in not repeating all that you ſpoke, and it is but this once, that I know, that *I* am thus charged: And the ſenſe, *I* think, is full in thoſe words that *I* do ſet down. Secondly, you go about to clear your ſelf from ſome aſperſions, concerning harſh ſpeeches uſed by you againſt learned Divines: in which, you ſay, you ſpeak not to me, but to others, ſtanding thus charged by them, and not by me. In which *I* am well content that you ſhould ſtand as right in your

Readers

Readers eyes as you can deſire, and ſhall forbear to rake further into that ulcer. Thirdly, you take me to task, and are content to put my name at length, *As for* Mr. *Blake's profeſſion, that he hath little of their learning, but is wholly theirs in this ignorance, I did ſtill think otherwiſe of him, and durſt not to have deſcrib'd him: But yet my acquaintance with him is not ſo great, as that I ſhould pretend to know him, better then he knows himſelf, and I dare not judge, but he ſpeaks as he thinks.* Good Sir, ſay it over again, that it may be known from an hand of your eminence; that I ſay, my learning is little; and that I ſpeak it, not more modeſtly, then truly, neither do you know, how much *I* ſuffer, that it is no more. Yet, leaſt the cauſe in which I appear ſhould ſuffer with me, or rather in me, let me aſſume ſo much boldneſſe, as to tell you, that *I* yet think, that, that little which through grace *I* have obtained, may ſerve to ſatisfie thoſe arguments, which this piece of yours holds forth againſt me. *I* have been often confounded with your multitude, but never perceived my ſelf ſhatter'd by your ſtrength; not that my learning is equall with yours, (*I* know my ſelf better, then to enter ſuch compariſons) but your cauſe is unequall to mine. Your advantage is not ſo great againſt me in the greatneſſe of your abilities, as mine againſt you in the goodneſſe of the cauſe. It would often go ill with a good cauſe if the moſt able Advocates ſhould not ſometimes be worſted, in the preſence of impartiall Judges. Should you and *I* make exchange, So that *I* were to appear in the cauſe that you maintain, and you in that which *I* defend, a weaker then you, would eaſily do that, which *I* think you have not yet done. But your willingneſſe is obſervable to take a hint from my mouth, to ſtrip me of all the learning of theſe learned men, charged with intolerable ignorance; and leave their ignorance only with me, as the whole you are willing to allow me. Yet in the next place you engage me to you in your endeavours to help me out of my ignorance in this. *Let me be hold to ſhew him,* (ſay you) *part of that, which he ſayth he is wholly ignorant of: That our perſonall inherent Righteouſneſſe is not denominated from the old Law, or Covenant, as if we were called righteous* (*beſides our imputed Righteouſneſs*) *only becauſe our Sanctification, and good works have ſome imperfect agreement to the Law of works.* But I were ignorant indeed, if you could ſurprize me with your con-

founding of theſe terms, [Law] and [Covenant.] Thoſe two I take much to differ. In your Aphoriſms, (where you think you ſpeak moſt full, and here complain, that *I* omitted ſomewhat of that which you there ſaid) you have the word [Law] and the word [Rule:] But *I* hear not of the word [Covenant] at all. But here, *Law*, and *Covenant*, are confounded, as though every Law were a Covenant, and every Covenant a Law. And *I* were yet more in ignorance, if *I* ſhould let your Syllogiſms paſs, as you have laid them down. The firſt of your ſeven is, *If no man be called Righteous by the Law of works, but he that perfectly obeyeth, (ſo as never to ſin) then no imperfect obeyer is called Righteous (niſi æquivocè) by that Lawy: But the Antecedent is true; Therefore ſo is the conſequent.* Here *I* would deſire that you would explain your ſelf, in what ſenſe any Law can call any particular man Righteous? The Law laies down generall Rules, and makes not particular application to this, or that perſon. If you mean that no man hath the denomination of a righteous, or juſt perſon, upon his obſervation of the precepts of the Law, you muſt except *Zachary*, and *Elizabeth*, and all other which in Scripture have the title of juſt, or righteous. *I* pray you conſult *Calvin* on *Luke* 1. 6. (o) *Neither is this definition*, ſaith he, *to be neglected, that they are juſt that frame their lives according to the precepts of the Law*; and afterward adds, *Becauſe the Lord doth not impute unto them ſin, he honours their holy life, though imperfect, with the title of righteouſneſs.* See alſo *Rivet*, on *Gen.* 6. 9. Exercit. 52. **Perfection begun in us, in all parts, though not compleat in degree, is a ſincere and undiſſembled obedience according to the whole Law, or a ſincere and ſerious endevour of obeying God according to all his Commandments.* God in the Covenant of Grace, looks upon and accepts a ſincere endeavour of ordering our converſation according to the precepts of works. All the reſt of the arguments, carry it to a deniall of juſtification by the Law, (which is far from me to go about to aſſert) but touch not upon denomination of [righteous] or [righteouſneſs] upon a ſincere endeavour of conformity to the Law. Who knows not but that the Law curſeth upon the leaſt trangreſſion, were there not a redreſs in the Goſpel? yet men of Goſpel-grace, to whom ſin is not imputed, are denominated righteous upon their ſincere

(o) *Neque enim eſt hæc definitio negligenda, juſtos eſſe, qui vitam ſuam formant ad legis præcepta. Dominus, quia illis peccata non imputavit, ſanctam illorum vitam licet imperfectam juſtitiæ titulo dignatus eſt.*

* *Perfectio verò inchoata per omnes partes in nobis etſi non abſoluta per gradus, eſt ſincera & ἀυπόκριτος ſecundum totam legem obedientia, ſive ſincerum ac ſerium ſtudium obediendi Deo ſecundum omnia ejus præcepta.*

cere, though weak endevour of conformity to the Law. (p) *A man may*, saith *Davenant*, *be denominated just* (q) *in himself, from such quality of righteousnesse, which is true, though it be imperfect, but he cannot be constituted, justified before God, but from that righteousnesse, which comprizeth all kind of perfection in it.* *Davenant*, de Just. habit. *pag.* 342. * *We are dead to the Law*, saith, *Gomarus*, *upon a severall account. To the Ceremoniall Law, as to necessary observation, justification, and condemnation. To the Moral Law, not as to righteousnesse, and observance, but as to justification.* *Gomarus* in *Galat.* 2. 19. So that the whole of these seven Syllogisms, may be put to the other thirty one, concerning unbaptized persons, believing in Christ Jesus. There is not one of the Conclusions that touch me. I say not that the Law judges *righteous*, or that men by the Law are judged *righteous*, but that God in the Covenant of Grace, eals weak conformity to the Law, [*righteousnesse*] and men of such consormity [*righteous.*] *Davenants* distinction of denomination of a just man, and a justified man, is a sufficient answer to all these arguments.

(q) A man may be denominated just from that rule that will not denominate him justified.

(p) *Potest homo in se justus denominari ab illâ qualitate justitiæ quæ est quantumvis imperfecta modo vera : at non potest constitui justificatus coram Deo nisi ab illâ justitiâ quæ omnes perfectionis numeros comprehendit.* * *Mortui sumus legi, diversâ ratione. Nam legi ceremoniali ratione necessariæ observationis, justificationis & condemnationis : morali vero non ratione justitiæ seu observationis, sed justificationis & condemnationis.*

SEC. III.

The Morall Law is a perfect rule of righteousnesse.

IN the next place, you take me up for saying, [I know no other Rule but the old Rule, the Rule of the Morall Law, that is with me a Rule, a perfect Rule, and the only Rule :] And make it your businesse to Catechize me better : And thereupon you say, *distinguendum est.* And so we have a multitude of distinctions, (too many to write out) with this Elogy] upon them : *I think the solidity and great necessity of all these distinctions is beyond dispute.* But I confesse, I cannot be induced to be of your mind. I think the solidity of some of them may well be disputed; and the necessity of most of them (as to our businesse) wholy denyed. I am to seek, how the pre-

Mr. *Brs.* distinctions discuss'd.

preceptive part of the Law of nature, *delivered to* Moſes, and the preceptive part of the Law of nature, *now uſed by Chriſt*, as his own Law, (which is one of your diſtinctions) do differ. Whether Chriſt and *Moſes*, in holding out a Law of nature, ſtand at any ſuch diſtance, may at leaſt be diſputed, though perhaps, when others ſee it not, you may be able to conclude it. I as yet neither know, any detraction from, or addition to, the preceptive part of the Law of nature by Chriſt. I think there was neither any abolition, addition, or diminution reſpective to the Law thus conſidered, made by our Saviour. I do not yet ſee reaſon ſo much as to recede from that opinion, that this Law, as delivered by *Moſes*, is binding to Chriſtians. If you be able to conclude the negative, yet I know, that as it hath been, ſo it may be ſtill diſputed. And when we are ſpeaking of the rule of *Righteouſneſſe* or obedience, which is the line and thread according to which our actions ſhould be ſquared, (under which you juſtly comprehend the prohibition as *præceptum de non agendis*) I ſee no neceſſity of talking either of a rule of *reward*, or *puniſhment*, or a rule of the *condition of the reward, or puniſhment*; which is another of your diſtinctions. Theſe three laſt Rules, if they be true Rules, may here, as to this buſineſſe, be very well over-ruled. They are not at all eſſentiall to a Law, as comming neither within the direction for duty, nor obligation to duty, but only ſerve *ad bene eſſe*, to quicken our obedience, and to withold from tranſgreſſion. As to the [Promiſe] God might have commanded us to work, and never have told us of any pay, and, The [Puniſhment] is upon ſuppoſall of fayling in duty. And if you thus bring them in, as acceſſary parts of the Law, yet I ſee no imaginable reaſon to ſpeak of them as Rules, unleſſe it be ſuch as God hath propoſed to himſelf, in his way of diſtributive Juſtice. They can be no Rule to us, determining only, (as your ſelf obſerve) what ſhall be done to us, not what ſhall be done by us. The firſt branch then of your fourfold diſtinction of a Rule is here alone of uſeful conſideration, that is, the Rule of Obedience, or what ſhall be due from us. We have nothing to ſay here either of the Rule of Reward, or Puniſhment, nor of the Rule of the condition of the Reward, or Puniſhment, which are your other branches. And that only, I here intended; and I had thought, all I would have known

known that I only intended it. This you say, you suppose is my meaning, as well you might: but withall you say, *It is strange to your ears; and give your reasons.* 1. *That is but part of that very Law of nature. Doth not the Law of nature* (say you) *as well as the Positive Law determine* de debito pœnæ, *as well as* de debito officii? But sure *debitum officii*, and not *debitum pœnæ*, is our Rule. 2. You say, *If you took it for the whole of nature, is that the only Rule?* And here comes in, it seems, that which is strange to your ears; that I should make the Moral Law, as determining *de debito officii*, our only Rule, perfect and compleat: Which assertion being so unanimously received, might well have delivered you from all wonder at the strangenesse of it, how erroneous soever you had judged it. Undertaking the negative part, and impleading it of imperfection, you have indeed *Arminians*, *Socinians*, and *Papists*, on your part. But *Protestants* (for ought I know) unanimously your adversaries. *Papists* have their Traditions added as well to the Law, as to the Gospel, which is an accusation of the written Law, as imperfect: They have also their Evangelicall Counsels, which though they are not commanded, yet (as *Bellarmine* speaks) are commended, as raising Christians to an higher perfection, then ever the Law required. *Socinians* (with whom many *Arminians* joyn) affirm, that Christ hath instituted new precepts of Obedience in the Gospel; and added them to the Commands of the Law, such as transcend and exceed all that were delivered in Old Testament-times. *Gerrard* having disputed for the perfection of the Law against *Papists*, cap. 14. *De Evangelio*, saith, *The Popish opinion of New Laws promulgated by Christ, the* Photinians (which is an other name of *Socinians*) *greedily imbrace; making a fair way for* Mahometisme, *seeing that in the* Alcoran *it is in like manner said, That* Moses *gave a Law, lesse perfect*, Christ *more perfect, and* Mahomet *most perfect of all.* Out of the *Cracovian* Catechisme in the same Chapter, *Gerrard* quotes this passage, *Christ came not only to fulfill the Law for us, but added new precepts to it. These new precepts*, (the same Author saith) *they make twofold: Some of which do appertain to manners, Some to ceremonies, or outward rites in worship.* He names three that appertain to manners: *To deny a mans self; take up his Crosse; and follow Christ*: Which three precepts my Author in way of

With whom they joyn that oppose the perfection of the Morall Law.

oppoſition ſaith, *belong to the firſt Commandement.* *Peltius* in his Harmony of *Arminians* and *Socinians*, Chap. 4, 5, 6. ſheweth their combination againſt the Orthodox party, as in many other things, ſo in this propoſition now controverted. Hee there quotes from *Socinians* theſe poſitions: *That Chriſt in the* New *Teſtament did not only abrogate the Ceremoniall and Judiciall Law, but did much increaſe and add unto the Morall Law: That he came not to deſtroy the Law, but to fulfil it; which fulfilling,* (ſaith he) *is nothing elſe but a perfecting of it, and addition of what was wanting: That we ought not only to obſerve thoſe things that are given to us of God, and not abrogated by Chriſt, but thoſe precepts in like manner that are added by Chriſt.* Much more from many *Socinians*, and *Arminians*, may be ſeen in that Author to that purpoſe. Dr. *Hammond* in his Practicall Catechiſme, ſpeaking of Chriſts Sermon in the Mount, agrees indeed with the *Papiſts* againſt the *Proteſtants*, *That Chriſt doth not here expound* Moſes, *and vindicate the Law from falſe gloſſes, but that he addes to the Law*, and names many additions to the 6. & 7 Commandement, & other Commandements, but diſſents from *Papiſts* that make theſe Evangelicall Counſels, and makes them precepts; not precepts of *Moſes*, but of *Chriſt*, added by him to the Law: but this with much Modeſty, as though he would not be peremptory in his opinion. So that * Mr. *Burges*, pag. 166. handling controverſies about the Law, ſaith, *I ſhall now handle the perfection of it, and labour to ſhew that Chriſt hath inſtituted no new duty, which was not commanded before by the Law of* Moſes. *And this queſtion,* (ſaith he) *will be profitable, partly againſt the* Arminians, *partly the* Papiſts, *and laſtly, the* Socinians. He further ſaith, *pag.* 169. *That Chriſt did not add new duties which were not commanded in the Law, becauſe the Law is perfect, and they were bound not to add to it, or detract from it, Therefore we are not to conceive a more excellent way of duty, then that preſcribed. Further, if we ſpeak of holy and ſpirituall duties, there cannot be a more excellent way of holineſſe, this being an* Idæa, *and repreſentation of the glorious nature of God.* Dr. *Ames* in his *Sciagraphia*, handling the Decalogue, makes this his firſt doctrine, (*a*) *The Law of God contained in the Decalogue is a moſt perfect Rule of the guide for the life of man.* He gives four reaſons, with an uſe of information, (*b*) *That we eſteem this Law as it ought to be eſteemed, & that, as the only Rule of our lives,*

and

* Authorities vouchſafed for the perfection of the Morall Law as a Rule.

(a) *Lex iſta Dei quæ in Decalogo continetur eſt perfectiſſima regula ad vitam hominis dirigendam.*

(b) *Ut legem iſtam Dei eo loco habeamus quo debemus* i. e. *ut non aliter de eadem cogitemus quam ut de vitæ noſtræ unica forma & tanquam de illa norma quæ nullum habet defectum ſed perfecta eſt in ſeſe & perfectionem omnem à nobis requirit.*

and such a Rule that hath no defect, but is perfect in it self, and requires all perfection in it. Davenant *de Justit. actual.* cap. 40. pag. 463. saith, (c) *The Law of God it self is a most exact and perfect Rule of Holiness and Righteousness:* And in the proof of it saith, (d) *This is every where confirmed in Scripture, which wonderfully extols the perfection of the divine Law.* *Downham* in the preface of his Tables of the Commandements saith, that, *The Law of God is perfect, requiring perfect obedience both inward and outward, not only in respect of the parts but of the degrees.* The *Leyden Professors* say, (e) *The Law is so perfect, that nothing in Moral precepts, either by Christ or his Apostles, as any more exact rule of good works hath been added under the New Testament.* Disp. 18. §. 39. *Ursinus* in his definition of the Morall Law inserts this, (f) *binding all reasonable creatures to perfect obedience both inward and outward,* Pag. 681. *Chemnitius* entitles his third Chapter *de Lege,* (g) *Of the perfect obedience which the law requires,* and presently laies down these words, (h) *This doctrine of the perfect obedience which the Law requires, in all ages past hath been, and is now depraved.* *Bucan* in his Common places, Pag. 188. thus defines the Morall Law; (i) *A divine injunction containing a rule to live piously and justly before God, requiring of all men perfect and perpetuall obedience towards God.* I shall conclude with the Confession presented to both houses of *Parliament,* by the Assembly of Divines, *Chap.* 19. 2. *The Law after his* (i. e. Adams) *fall, continued to be a perfect Rule of Righteousnes, and as such was delivered by God on mount* Sinai *in ten Commandements;* To these, more might be addded, but these are sufficient to take you out of that wonder that I should assert the perfection of it.

(c) *Ipsa lex Christi est exactissima & perfectissima regula Sanctitatis et justitiæ*

(d) *Passim in Scripturis confirmatur quæ perfectionem legis divinæ mirificè extollunt.*

(e) *Tam perfecta est hæc lex ut nihil ei in præceptis moralibus aut à Christo aut ab Apostolis ipsius additum fuerit quoad exactiorem bonorum operum normam sub novo Testamento sit adducta.*

(f) *Obligans omnes creaturas rationales ad perfectam obedientiam internam & externam.*

(g) *De perfectâ obedientiâ quam Lex requirit.* (h) *Variis autem corruptelis omnibus temporibus, & olim, & nunc depravata est doctrina de perfectâ obedientia, quam Lex Dei requirit.* (i) *Est præceptio divina continens piè justéq; coram Deo vivendi regulam, requirens ab omni homine perfectam & perpetuam obedientiam.*

But I shall not rest barely upon the authority of these testimonies, but offer to your consideration these following reasons.

Arguments evincing the perfection of the Morall Law.

1. If the Law be not a fully perfect and compleat Rule of our lives, then there is some sin against God which is not condemned in the Law, this is clear; Deviation from any rule given of God is a sin; Deviation from that supposed additionall rule is a sin: But there is no sin which the Law doth not condemn; *Sin is a Transgression of the Law,* 1 John 3, 4. He that sins, transgresseth the Law.

2. If the Law alone diſcovers and makes ſin known, then it is a perfect, full, and compleat Rule; this is plain: *Omne rectum index eſt obliqui.* But the Law alone diſcovers ſin, *Rom.*3.20. This office is aſcribed there to the Law, and is no other but the Morall Law. Had not the light of that Rule guided him in this work, he had never made any ſuch diſcovery: And it is the moral Law written in the decalogue that he means, as appears in the quotation; *I had not known luſt, except the Law had ſaid, Thou ſhalt not covet.*

3. That which alone works wrath is the alone Rule and guide of our lives. This is clear, in what ſence ſoever it is, that we take working of wrath: whether we underſtand it of working of wrath in man againſt God, as ſome do; Mans heart being apt to riſe againſt him that will exerciſe Soveraignty over him. Or of the wrath of God kindled againſt man upon tranſgreſſion of the Law. But it is the Law that works wrath: it is aſcribed to it, and it alone, *Rom.*4.15.

4. That which being removed will take away all poſſibility of ſinning, that is alone the Rule of our obedience: This is plain; were there any Rule, the tranſgreſſion of it would be ſtill our ſin. But the Law being removed, all poſſibility of ſin is taken away: *Where there is no Law, there is no tranſgreſſion,* Rom.4 15.

5. If the Law only adds ſtrength to ſin, *viz.* for condemnation, then the Law is the alone Rule of obedience: This is plain; Any other Rule whatſoever addes like ſtrength to ſin, and upon tranſgreſſion will condemne. But the Law only addes ſtrength to ſin, 1 *Cor.* 15.56. *The ſtrength of ſin is the Law.*

6. Either the epithite [*morall*] is not juſtly given to the Law, or elſe it is a perfect Rule of manners, that is, of obedience: This is plain; for *morall* denotes, as *Ameſius* obſerves, that uſe of it. But this epithite given to the Law, and appropriated to it, was never (as I think) upon any ſuch account challenged. *Ergo.*

7. Either this new Rule doth tranſcend the old Rule of the Morall Law, requiring a more exact degree of perfection (as *Papiſts* ſpeak of their Evangelicall counſels, & *Socinians* of their additionall Goſpell precepts) or elſe it falls ſhort and admits of obedience in a degree more low. If it require obedience more high, then even the doers of the Law, in the greateſt highth and poſſible ſuppoſed perfection; though equall to the Angels, are

ſinners:

sinners: The Law might be fulfilled, and yet disobedience charged. If it fall short of the old Rule (which it seems is your opinion, seeing you confesse an imperfection in our personall righteousnesse, as it refers to the old Rule; and assert a perfection, as it relates to the new Rule) then the new Rule allows that which the old Rule condemnes, and so you bring in a discrepancy between them, and find an allowance for transgression. So that I think, I have sufficient authority, divine and humane, with reasons that are cogent, to conclude that which I have asserted, That the old Rule, the Rule of the Moral Law, is a perfect Rule, and the only Rule.

You come in here with six several exceptions taken against the (*a*) perfection of this Law, or singularity of it, as rule.

(*a*) Exceptions taken against the perfection of of the Law.

1. You demand, *What say you for matter of duty to the positive* (*b*) *precepts for the Gospel? of Baptism; the Lords day; the Officers and government of the Church, &c? Is the Law of nature the only rule for these?* And foreseeing what I would answer, as well you might, you adde, *If you say, they are reducible to the second commandment, I demand,* 1. *What is the second commandment, for the affirmative part, but a general precept to worship God, according to his positive institution?* 2. *Do ye take the precept* de genere *to be equivalent to the precepts* de speciebus? &c. To this *I* think *I* may answer out of your own mouth. *Aphor.* pag. 149. *The neglect of Sacraments is a breach of the second commandment.* In case we break the commandments in the neglect of them, then the commandment requires the observation of them. For which you may consult also, Mr. *Burges* Vindiciæ legis *pag.* 149. *Balls* Catechisme, *Amesius* his Sciographia, *Dod* on the Commandments, *Downhams* Tables, *Zanchy*, each of them on this Commandment; and *Cawdry* and *Palmer* on the Sabbath, *Part.* 2. *Pag.* 176. For further clearing of this point, we must consider of the preceptive part of the Moral Law, which alone in this place, is our business to enquire after, 1. As it is *epitomized* in the Decalogue, those *ten words*, as *Moses* cals them, *Exod.* 34. 28. or else, as *commented upon*, or more amply delivered in the whole Book of the Law, Prophets, and Scriptures of the New Testament. 2. We must distinguish of the manner how the Law prescribes, or commands any thing as duty, which is either *expresly*, or *Synecdockically*, either *directly*, or else *interpretatively*, *virtually*, *and reductively*;

(*b*) 1. Exception.

I very well know, that the Law is not in all particulars ſo explicitely, and expreſly delivered, but that, 1. The uſe and beſt improvement of Reaſon is required to know, what *pro hic & nunc* is called for at our hands for duty. The Law lays down rules in affirmative precepts, in an indefinite way, which we muſt bring home by particular application, diſcerning by general Scripture Rules, with the help of reaſon (which ſometimes is not ſo eaſie to be done) when it ſpeaks to us in a way of concernment, as to preſent practicall obſervation. 2. That hints of providence are to be obſerved, to know what in preſent is duty, as to the affirmative part of the commandments of God. If that man, that fell among theeves, between *Jeruſalem* and *Jericho*, had fate by the way, on the green graſs, without an appearance of harm, or preſent need of help, the Samaritane that paſſed that way, had not offended, in caſe he had taken no more notice, then the Prieſt & Levite did: But diſcerning him in that caſe as he then was, the fixt commandment called for that, which he then did, as a preſent office of love to his neighbour, according to the interpretation of this commandment given by our Saviour, *Mark.* 3. 4. When the Phariſees watched him, whether he would heal the man with the withered hand on the Sabbath day, He demands of them, Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day, or to do evill, To ſave life, or to deſtroy? It was not their mind, that Chriſt ſhould kill the man, onely they would not have had him then to have cur'd him: but not to cure, when it is in our power, according to Chriſt's interpretation, is to kill. If diligent obſervation be not then made, the commandment may be ſoon tranſgreſs'd. 3. Skill in Sciences, and profeſſions, is to be improved by men of skill, that the commandment may be kept. The Samaritane powred Wine and Oyl into the Samaritans wounds, knowing that to be of uſe, to ſupple and refreſh them: Had he known any other thing more ſoveraign, which might have been had, at hand, he was to have uſed it. As skill in Medicines is to be uſed for preſervation of mens lives, ſo alſo skill in the Laws, by thoſe that are vers'd in them, for the help of their neighbour, in exigents concerning his eſtate and livelihood. 4. We muſt liſten to Gods mouth, to learn when he ſhall be pleaſed at any time, further to manifeſt his mind, for the clearing of our way in any of his precepts. There was a command, concerning the

the place of publique, and solemn worship, *Deut.* 12. 5. *Unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even to his habitation shall ye seek, and thither shalt thou come.* Now they must depend on the mouth of God, to observe what place in any of the Tribes he would choose for his habitation. When God commands, that all instituted worship shall be according to his prescript; this is a perfect Rule implicite, and virtual, tying us to heed the Lord at any time, more particularly discovering his will, and clearing this duty to us. Was not the Law of worship, perfect to *Abraham*, unless it explicitely told him that he must sacrifice his Son? And if you take your self to be so acute, as to set up a new Rule, as you are pleased to stile it, then you antiquate and abolish the old Rule, and singularly gratifie the Antinomian party. Two Rules will no more stand together then two Covenants: In that you say a new Rule, you make the first old: Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is *ready to vanish away*, Heb. 8. 13. You adde moreover, doth not the Scripture call Christ our Law-giver, and say, The Law shall go out of *Zion*, &c. *Is.* 2. 3. And was not I pray you the old Law, (as you are pleased to call it) his? Saint *Paul* I am sure quotes that which belongs to the preceptive part of the Moral Law, and calls it the *Law of Christ*, Gal. 6. 2. His Laws were delivered in the wilderness, whom the people of *Israel* there tempted and provoked; This is plain, for they sinn'd against their Law-giver, and from his hands they suffered. And who they tempted in the wilderness, see from the Apostles hand, 1 *Cor.* 10. 9. And as to your Scripture, the words quoted are exegetically set down in those that follow them. *The Law shall go out of* Zion, *and the word of the Lord out of* Jerusalem: Which is no more, but that the name of the Lord, which was then known in *Judah*, shal be great from the rising of the sun, to the going down thereof. You further demand, *And is he not the anointed King of the Church, and therefore hath legislative power?* For answer, I desire to know what King the Church had when the old Law was, before Christ came in the flesh? the Kingdome was one & the same, & the King one and the same then, and now, as I take it. *Many shall come from the East, & West, & shall sit down with* Abrah. Isaac *and* Jacob, *in the kingdome of heaven.* The Gentiles comming in at the Gospel-call, are under the

the same King, and in the same Kingdome. And if all this were granted you for which you here plead, it is no more then a change in some positive, circumstantial Rites, and what is this to our question, That our righteousnesse, which is imperfect according to the old Rule, can be perfect according to the new? when old and new in that which is naturally Moral, is ever one and the same. When the Law required heart-service, and love with the whole heart, upon spiritual ends and motives, upon which account all fell short in their obedience, and performance, shall we say that Christ did dispense with any of this? so the Rule being lower, our obedience now may answer. Others that make *Moses* and Christ two distinct Law-givers and agents for God, in holding out distinct precepts, give the pre-eminence to Christ, and account his Law to be of more eminent perfection. You on the contrary seem to make the Laws of Christ to stoop far beneath those of *Moses*.

2. Exception. 2. For Justification of your accusation of the Moral Law of imperfection, you say, *I think the Moral Law, taken either for the Law given to* Adam, *or written in tables of stone, is not a sufficient Rule for us now, for believing in Jesus Christ, no nor the same Law of nature as still in force under Christ. For a generall command* (say you) *of believing all that God revealeth, is not the only Rule of our faith, but the particular revelation and precept are part, &c.* To this I say,

1. As before, I think I may answer out of your own mouth, where you say, *Neglect of Sacraments is a breach of the second Commandement, and unbelief is a breach of the first.* If we break the Commandement in unbelief, then the Commandement binds us to believe.

2. Much of that which I have spoke by way of answer to your former, may be applyed to this likewise.

3. I have already spoke to this, that faith is a duty of the Moral Law, *Treat of the Covenant*, Chap. 3. pag. 18, 19. To which I refer the Reader.

4. If *Adam* had no command for faith, then he was not in any capacity to believe, and by his fall lost not power of believing: And consequenly it will not stand with the Justice of God to exact it at our hands, having never had power for the performance of it.

5. I say, there was power in *Adam*, for that *faith that justi-*

fied

fied, but not to *act for justification*. *Adam* had that habit, and the Law calls for it, from all that are under the Command of it: But the Gospel discovers the object by which a sinner through faith is Justified.

3. The same answer may serve to your third objection, which indeed is the same with the former, only a great deal of flourishing is bestowed, in discourse of the understanding and will, paralleling them with the Prefaces, grounds and occasions of Laws. And at last bringing all to the Articles of the Creed, to which enough allready is spoken. 3. Exception.

4. You say, *But what if all this had been left out, and you had proved the Morall Law the only Rule of duty? doth it follow thereforе that it is the only Rule? Answ.* I take righteousnesse to be matter of duty, and then the only Rule of duty, is the only Rule of righteousnesse. You say further, *Sure it is not the only Rule of rewarding*. And I say, Rewarding is none of our work, but Gods, and I look for a Rule of that work which is ours, and that we are to make our business, I confess an imperfection in it to give life, but assert a perfection as the Rule of our lives, It justifies no man, but it orders and regulates every justified man. 4. Exception.

5. You say, *The same I may say of the Rule of Punishment*. To which I give the same answer: It is not our work, but Gods, either to reward or punish. And here you speak of a part of the penalty of the new Law: And I know no penalty properly distinct from the penalty of the old. You were wont to compare it to an Act of Oblivion, and Acts of Oblivion are not wont to have their penalties. You instance in that of the Parable, *None of them that were bidden shall taste of the supper*; when the sin for which they there suffer is a breach of a Morall Command. 5 Exception.

6. You say, *The principall thing that I intend is, that the Morall Law is not the only Rule, what shall be the condition of Life or Death, and therefore not the only Rule according to which we must now be denominated, and hereafter sentenced, Just or Unjust*. To this I have already given a sufficient answer, and if I had not, you answer fully for me, *Aphor. p.* 144 *Thes.* 28. Where you say, *The precepts of the Covenant, as meer precepts, must be distinguished from the same precepts considered as conditions: upon performance of which we must live, or die for non-performance*. And I speak 6. Exception.

speak of them as meer precepts, and so they are our Rule of righteousnes, and not as they are conditions either of the Covenant of works or grace: And a man may be denominated righteous by the Laws Rule, when he cannot stand before the sentence of it as a Covenant, of which we have heard sufficient. After a long discourse against all possibilitie of Justification by the Law of works (as though I were therein your adversarie, or that the *Antinomian* fancy were above all answer, that a man cannot make the Law his Rule, but he makes it withall his Justification) you go about to prevent an objection and say, *If you should say, this is the Covenant and not the Law*, you then tell me that you will reply, 1. *Then the Law is not the only Rule.* To which I say, When my work is to make it good, that the Law is our only Rule, I marvaile that you will so much as imagine that I will say that which makes it not the only Rule. But perhaps, you think I do not see, how it cannot follow, as indeed I do not, neither can I see any colour for it. 2. You reply, *It is the same thing in severall respects, that we call a Law and a Covenant (except you mean it of our Covenant-act to God, of which we speak not) who knowes not that* præmiare *and* punire *are Acts of a Law? And that an Act of Oblivion or generall pardon on certain terms is a Law, and that the promise is the principall part of the Law of Grace.* To which I say, that *præmiare* and *punire* are not essentiall in a Law. Some have power of command, so that their words in just things is to be a Law, where most deny any power of punishment; as an Husband over the Wife. Some Parents have Authority to command Children, (Children remaining under the obligation of the fifth Commandment as long as the relation of a Child continueth) when they have neither power to reward or punish. *Jacob* took himself to be in power to command *Joseph* (among the rest of his Sons, as appears in the charge that he gives concerning his buriall, *Gen.*47.29,30. and Chap. 49.29. So compared) and yet he was not in power either to reward or punish him. And though they be acts of a law where he that gives the Law is in power; Yet they are no parts of a Rule, nor any directiory of life to him to whom they are proposed. I know that an Act of Oblivion or generall pardon may be called a Law, as many other things are, *catachrestice* and *alusivè*; but that it should be a Law properly so called,

I know not. The *Romanes* defined a Law, whilst that a *Democratie* was in force among them, to be, *Generale jussum populi aut plebis rogante magistratu.* Afterwards, when the State was changed, and the Legislative power was in other hands, they defined it to be, *Jussum Regis aut Imperatoris.* And *Tullye's* definition of a Law is, that it is, *Ratio summa insita in natura, quæ recta suadet, prohibetque contraria.* Here *jussio*, *suasio*, and *prohibitio* are expres'd, which are not found in Acts of Oblivion. That every man, who is within the verge of such an Act, may be said to be acquit by Law, I willingly grant; seeing that Act takes off the form of the Law force condemning him: But that it is a Law, strictly so taken, I know not. You conclude, that you have now given some of your reasons, why you presumed to call that [*Ignorance.*] And I must presume to acquaint you, that till *I* hear more of your reasons, *I* shall remain in this, as *Ignorant* as ever.

SECT. IV.

Imperfect conformity to the Law, is Righteousness inherent; as an Image, less like the Pattern, is an Image.

I Said in my Treatise, [The perfection of this Holiness and Righteousness in mans integrity, stood in the perfect conformity to this Law; and the reparation of this in our regenerate estate (in which the Apostle placeth the Image of God) must have reference, as to God as a pattern, so to his Law as a Rule.] Here I pass by some words of yours of a Transcendentall p. rfection, not well understanding them, much less understanding that they serve at all to our purpose, and come to your second, where you answer, *That there is a partial reparation of our Holiness in Regeneration, but no reparation of our personall, inherent Righteousness at all. Is Righteousness by the Law of works? I take this to be dangerous doctrine. Answ.* You entituled this controversie, *pag.* 41. *Sect.* 28. [*Of Evangelical personal Righteousness*] And now you understand it, of *personal, inherent, Legal Righteousness.* Are Legal and Evangelical the same, or, are not you the same? When the Apostle joyns Righteousness, and true holiness together, as that in which the Image of God did consist, and is to be repaired in the Regenerate, Is there a partial reparation of the one, and no reparation at all of the other?

There is a partial reparation of inherent righteousness in regeneration.

In your former reply, you ſay, *I hope you obſerve, that we ſpeak not of that called Morall Righteouſneſs, conſiſting in an habit of giving every man his own*, but of *juſtitia forenſis*: where you ſeem to make that a full definition of ſuch Righteouſneſs; when I had thought that Moral righteouſneſs had given God, as well as man, his own: And if we ſpeak not of this righteouſneſs, when we ſpeak of a Rule of righteouſneſs, I cannot but obſerve, that it hath been a wild diſcourſe, and little to purpoſe, ever ſince either of us entred upon it, either we ſpeak of this, or elſe (I think) we might as well have kept ſilence. I know no inherent Righteouſneſs, that is not Moral Righteouſneſs. You demand, *Is Righteouſneſs by the Law of works? I take this for dangerous doctrine.* *Anſw.* You put it as though I intended, that the Law raiſeth a man to that Righteouſneſs for which it calls in order to juſtification, and life, according to the tenor of the Covenant of works, which were dangerous doctrine indeed, rendring Chriſts death to be in vain, as we may ſee from the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 2. 21. And of the more danger it is; the more I ſuffer. I ſay, that the Righteouſneſs of which I ſpeak, (and which, all, I think, underſtand, when they ſpeak (as you do of a believing mans perſonal, inherent Righteouſneſs) is from the Spirit of God, working with power in the hearts of his choſen, but yet according to the Rule of the Law of God, and led by no other Rule. And here I think there is no danger.

I illuſtrated this with a compariſon [As an Image carrying an imperfect reſemblance of its Sampler, is an Image: ſo conformity, imperfectly anſwering the Rule, is conformity likewiſe.] Here 1. You come in with yoor *Dilemma* againſt me. *Either that Image ſay you, is like the Sampler in ſome parts, and unlike in others, or elſe it is like in no part, but near to like. If the latter, then it is but near to a true Image of that thing, and not one indeed. If the former, then it is nothing to our caſe.* *Anſw.* You may do well to tell us, *what near to like* means, in the mean time, I muſt tell you, that you bring no perfect enumeration. *It* is like in all parts, though not with a full reſemblance, compleat in degree. 2. You tell me that *Scheibler* ſaies, *that ſimilitude do's lie in* puncto *as it were, and* ex parte ſui *admits not of* magis *and* minus, *and therefore* ſtrictè & philoſophicè loquendo, *ſaith he, that is only* ſimile, *which is perfectly ſo, but* vulgariter loquendo,

do, *that is called* ſimile, *which is properly but* minùs diſſimile. And then you adde by way of conceſſion, that *Scripture ſpeaks* vulgariter *often, and not* ſtrictè & Philoſophicè, *as ſpeaking to vulgar wits, to whom it muſt ſpeak, as they can underſtand.* Give me leave then that pretend to know no more then a vulgar wit, to ſpeak the language of Scripture, which I think was your own language in the laſt Section, where you ſaid, that *There is a partiall reparation of our holineſs in our regeneration*, and this, the Apoſtle tels us is the reparation of the Image of God, *Eph.* 4. 24. And as I take it, the language of *Scheibler* alſo in his Topicks, where I had thought he had ſpoken *ſtrictè* or *logicè* at leaſt, and there he ſaith, *Paria à ſimilibus omnino differunt*, and how they differ *I* know not, if there be not *magis* and *minùs in ſimili*, as there is not in *Pari*. As you confeſs it to be true in Scripture-ſenſe; ſo I take it, with *Scheiblers* leave, to be true in the exacteſt philoſophical ſenſe. Similitude is founded in quality, as parity in quantity; And that qualities are intended and remitted, *I* ſhall believe, till *I* have learn'd new Logick. *Davenant* in *Coloſ.* 3. 10. ſaith, *This is to be held, that Chriſt is otherwiſe the Image of the Father then we. He is the Image of equality, enjoying the ſame nature with the Father, whoſe Image he is. Every regenerate man is the Image of imitation, imperfectly reſembling ſome ſimilitude of the divine nature in certain gifts of grace.* You conclude, *If all this were otherwiſe, it is little to your purpoſe, for in this conformity of ours, there is ſomthing of quantitative reſemblance as well as qualitative, and ſo it hath a kind of quantity and parity in it as well as ſimilitude to the rule. Anſw.* What there is of quantity, and how much, you do not tell, and if there be not only a ſimilitude, but alſo a parity between God and man, ſo that when God is judged of man, he ſhould be tryed by his peers, *I* ſhall ſay nothing, but reſt amazed.

Similitude conſiſteth not in *puncto*, but admits of *magis* and *minùs*.

SECT. V.

Our actions are denominated good or evill, from the Law only.

TO your next Section, in which you complain of unfair dealing at my hands, I have ſpoken ſufficiently: your cloſe

only is obſervable. *No doubt*, ſay you, *but that ſincere obedience conſiſteth in a faithfull endeavour to obey the whole preceptive part of Gods Law, both natural, and poſitive; but no man can by it be denominated righteous* (niſi æquivocè) *but he that perfectly obeyeth in degree.* Your conceſſion I accept, but wonder at your aſſertion. Is not doing required in, and by the Law, and did *John* equivocate when he ſaid, *He that doth righteouſneſs is Righteous*, 1 John 3.7. And do you equivocate alſo when you put it in your title page of this piece againſt me? *Is* that an equivocal honour that is given to *Zachary*, and *Elizabeth*, to *Abel*, *Lot*, *Joſeph*, *Simeon*, and divers others in Scriptures? The men of *Sodom* were denominated wicked upon their breach of Gods Law, being ſinners exceedingly: And *Lot* is denominated Righteous upon his obſervation of it. *I* ſaid in my Treatiſe, [A perfection of ſufficiency to attain the end, *I* willingly grant, God condeſcending through rich grace to crown our weak obedience; *In* this ſenſe our imperfection hath its perfectneſs: otherwiſe *I* muſt ſay, that our inherent Righteouſneſs is an imperfect Righteouſneſs, is an imperfect conformity to the Rule of Righteouſneſs.] Here you are diſpleaſed, with the ambiguity, as you ſay, of the word [otherwiſe] and tell me of a natural perfection, or imperfection, of which actions are capable, without relation to the Rule, which you confeſs is nothing to this buſineſs. And then you adde, *Many a School Divine hath written* (& Gibieuf *at large*) *that our actions are ſpecified* à fine, *and denominated good, or evill, and ſo perfect, or imperfect*, à fine, *more eſpecially* à fine *then* à lege. *But this requires more ſubtilty and acurateneſs for the diſciſſion, then you, or I, in theſe looſe diſputes do ſhew our ſelves guilty of.* *Anſw.* If there be no more ſubtlety & acurateneſs in theſe many School-men & *Gibieuf*, then that which you pleaſe to quote out of them, and particularly out of him; there is no deſpair, but either you, or I, might ſoon render our ſelves guilty of as much ſubtlety and acurateneſs as they: And indeed, [*guilty*,] is the moſt proper term, I think, that can be given to diſcourſes of this nature. Actions, (ſay they, as you quote them) are denominated *good*, or *evill*, and ſo *perfect*, *or imperfect* à fine, rather then *à lege*, Though the Law that commands an action, and the end at which the action aimes, or ought to aime, ſtand in a Diametrical oppoſition, and the end is wholly without the cognizance of the Law.

Did

Did not thoſe Jewes in the time of the captivity, tranſgreſs the Law of God, when they faſted and mourned, & did not faſt and mourn at all *unto God?* Zach. 7. 5. And did not the Phariſees break the Law, when they did their almes to be ſeen of men, and pray'd in Synagogues, and Streets, upon that account alſo, that men ſhould obſerve them? The Law, had it been heeded, would have led them hgther, as we may ſee in our Savious words, *Mat.* 22. 37. According to this doctrine, a good meaning, or intention, will ſalve the worſt action. *Saul* had then performed the Commandment of the Lord, as he ſaid to *Samuel*, when he ſpared the beſt of the Sheep and Oxen, for ſacrifice to the Lord God; that had been a pious end, if no command had prohibited it. But to give *Gibieuf* his due, I have examined his diſpute, *De fine*, and there cannot find that he makes any ſuch compariſon, or puts ſuch oppoſition, nor that he ſo much as mentions the Law, when he ſpeaks ſo much *De fine*, as you mention. I referred to Dr. *Davenant De Juſtit. habit.* pag. 349. diſputing againſt Juſtification by inherent Righteouſneſs, upon the account of the imperfection of it. To this is replyyd, *Do not you obſerve, that I affirm, that which you call inherent Righteouſneſs to be imperfect, as well as* Bp. *Davenant. Anſw.* Why is it then that you laid ſo high a charge of ignorance on learned Divines calling it imperfect? when you well know, that they had not any ſuch notion of a Metaphyſical entity in their heads, but maintained what they ſpake, (as indeed Reverend *Davenant* do's) with that which you call *a ſimple objection*, that as we are called holy, by an imperfect holineſs, ſo we are called Righteous, by an imperfect Righteouſneſs. They never refer their Righteouſneſs to the Law as a Covenant. You can find no way to charge them and acquit him. As to this, They are as learned as he, and he as ignorant as they. You adde, *Yea I ſay more, that in reference to the Law of works, our works are no true Righteouſneſs at all: Anſw.* If you mean by the Law of works, not a Rule, but a Covenant, I ſay, with you, That they are no ſuch righteouſneſſe as will obtain the grace, or avoid the penalty of it: yet this reference to this Covenant, cannot make imperfect righteouſneſs *ſimpliciter* no righteouſneſs, though *ſecundum quid*, or *verſus hoc*, it is ſuch. If I am bound in ſtrict juſtice, to pay the ſum of a thouſand pound, and bring an hundred inſtead of it, this is money, though

though it is no full pay, or totall diſcharge. You ſay further, *He that ſaith, they are no Righteouſneſs, ſaith as little for them, as he that ſaith they are an imperfect Righteouſneſs. Anſw.* The queſtion is not, who ſpeaks more or leſs againſt this righteouſneſs, but who ſpeaks moſt truth. And Righteouſneſs being, as *Rollock* on *Epheſ.* 4. 24. obſerves, *A vertue in man, whereby he wils and do's thoſe things, which agree with the Law of God*, and as *Gomarus* on Mat. 3. 15. defines it, *An obedience due to God, and ſtill joyn'd with holineſſe*, it cannot be nothing, and yet it can be no better then imperfect. You ſay, *You ſuppoſe that I know that* Pp. Davenant *doth not onely ſay as much as you for the intereſt of works in juſtification, but alſo ſpeaks in the very ſame notions as you do, referring me, where I may find it in* Davenant. *Anſw.* 1. The intereſt of works in juſtification, is not to our preſent queſtion, of the perfection, or imperfection of righteouſneſs: & therefore whether he be, therein for you, or againſt you, it is not to this queſtion much materiall. Yet ſeeing you ſpeak ſo confidently here to me, and more fully elſe where, that you have this Reverend Author in that point firm on your part, inſomuch that having quoted a Century of witneſſes that are (as you ſay) for you, you adde, *If the reader would know which of theſe ſpeak moſt my own thoughts; I anſwer, moſt of them, if not all, in a great part, but* Davenant *moſt fully*, Confeſſ. pag. 457. It will be worth our pains to make ſome further enquiry: And at the firſt ſight, the thing doubtleſs will appear to all your Readers, that have read *Davenant*, as wonderfully ſtrange. If he ſpeak your thoughts ſo fully, how comes it to paſs, that you have ſo many adverſaries as you complain of? when he, for ought I know, amongſt *Proteſtant* writers, hath none at all; If you ſpeak both the ſame thing, your Adverſaries doubtleſſe would be his; And his work being ſo much more large then yours; he would have found ſo many more Adverſaries then you. His work was publiſhed before yours; and if you intended to publiſh no other doctrine, How could you know, that yours was like to blaſt your reputation with moſt Divines, (as in your Printed Letter, you tell, Mr. *Tombs* Pag. 409) When his work has much advanc'd and not blaſted his reputation at all? In this Apology you tell me, Pag. 16. of four great errors of the *Proteſtant* party in the doctrine of Juſtification; acquitting Engliſh Reformers in one of them only, And all (except that one) *Davenant* is as guilty as any. The

The first is, *That the formall cause of our Righteousnesse is the formall Righteousnesse of Jesus Christ, as suffering and perfectly obeying for us.* And if this be an error, no man is more chargeable then he with it. He makes this the title of his 28. *Chap. de Justit. habit.* (a) *The imputed Righteousnesse of Christ, is proved to be the formall cause of our Justification.* Making it good in that Chapter, by 11. Arguments, and answering contrary objections. Having confirm'd it with Arguments, he proceeds in the next Chapter to back it with Authorities: And quoting *Justin Martyr* in the first place, he thus comments upon him. (b) *Here* Justin Martyr *doth evidently teach, that not only the death and satisfaction of Christ, is imputed to us, to take away our punishment, but also his conversation and active obedience is imputed to us, to take away sin,* Pag. 374. The like we may find Pag. 378. upon occasion of quotation out of *Cyrillus Alexandrinus.* The next error charged upon *Protestants* by you is', *about the way and manner of our participation of this Righteousnesse,* which the Divines say, is by *imputation.* And so *Davenant* says, as we have already heard, asserting against *Bellarmine* the greatest necessity (as he speaks) of it, Pag. 32. Quoting against him Scriptures for it, explaining *Protestants* meaning in it. (c) *We think* (saith he) *that Justification is placed in this imputation; not only because Christs covers us with his Righteousnesse; but much rather, because he freely conferrs his righteousnesse upon us. Neither do we say, that God accounts us as just; only because he sees us Cloathed with the Righteousnesse of our Redeemer; but because he sees by his own ordination, all believers united into Christ as one person; made truly partakers of his obedience.* But perhaps, you are most offended with that, which you put in the close of your Charge of this error upon Reformers, *That we are hereby* (namely, by imputation of this Righteousnesse) *esteemed* legaliter, *to have fulfilled the Law in Christ:* Which in your account, is so high an error, that with you it is one of the pillars of *Antinomianisme.* And quoting these words from a Reverend Brother, whom sometimes at least you have had in high esteem, *That as in Christs suffering we were lookt upon by God, as suffering in him; So by Christs obeying of the Law, we are beheld as fulfilling the Law in him;* You appeale to you Reader whether it be true, or tolerable. You seem to think, that the naming it, is enough to work a deep dislik

(a) *Imputatam Christi obedientiam esse causam formalem Justificationis nostræ probatur*

(b) *Hic apertè docet* Justinus Martyr *non modo mortem & satisfactionem imputari ad pœnam delendam, sed ipsam conversationem ejus, seu obedientiam activam imputari nobis ad peccatum obliterandum.*

(c) *Nos vero hâc imputatione justificationem sitam putamus, non eo nomine solum quod Christus nos tegit justitiâ suâ, sed multò magis quia donat nos justitiâ suâ. Neque dicimus Deum nos pro justis habere solummodo quia tectos conspicit justitia Redemptoris nostri sed quia ex sua ordinatione omnes credentes, atque in unam personam cum Christo coalescentes, justitiæ ejus & obedientiæ verè participes factos.*

diſlike, if not deteſtation of it. And if *Davenant* here be not as blame-worthy as he, I am much miſtaken. See his third Argument for confirmation of his Theſis before mentioned, *Pag.* 364. (d) *God in beholding the obedience performed by Chriſt, even to the death of the Croſſe, delivers us from the puniſhment due to the tranſgreſſors of the Law; imputing this ſatisfaction of another to us, even as though it had been ours. Therefore in beholding the obedience of Chriſt yeelded even to the fulfilling of the Law, he confers theſe benefits upon us which are promiſed to the obſervers of the Law, that is, by imputing to us this righteouſneſſe of another, as though it were ours.* And much more to this purpoſe; And afterwards, further explaining himſelf, he ſayth: (e) *As, upon ſight of this imputed ſatisfaction,* God *doth deliver us from wrath and puniſhment, as though we had made ſatisfaction in our own perſons; So, upon ſight of the Law fulfilled by Chriſt for us, he accepts us unto life and glory, as though with our own perſonall Righteouſneſſe we had fulfilled the Law.* The third error which is charged upon *Proteſtants* is, that, from which Engliſh Reformers are acquitted.

The fourth is, *About the formall reaſon of faiths intereſt in Juſtification:* Which *Proteſtant* Reformers ſay, (as you obſerve from them) *is, as the inſtrument.* This indeed *Davenant* doth not put to the queſtion, and purpoſely handle, that I know, as he does the former. Yet we find him fully aſſerting it. Anſwering *Bellarmines* objection, that (f) *Luther made faith the formall cauſe of Juſtification,* he ſaith, that *Luther alwaies acknowledged it the inſtrumentall, but not the formall, unleſſe under the name of faith he include the object apprehended by faith, as though he ſhould ſay, that the obedience of Chriſt apprehended by faith is the formall cauſe of our Juſtification.* Where we plainly ſee *Davenants* mind.

1. That that which apprehends and applies the righteouſneſs of Chriſt for juſtification, is the inſtrumentall cauſe in it. 2. That faith apprehends and applies this righteouſneſs of Chriſt for juſtification; and conſequently, with him, Faith is

(d) *Deus ex intuitu obedien i per Chriſtum præſtitæ uſq; ad mortem crucis, nos liberavit à pœnâ debitâ legis tranſgreſſoribus, imputando nobis hanc alterius ſatisfactionem, perinde ac ſi noſtra fuiſſet: Ergo ex intuitu obedientiæ per Chriſtum præſtitæ uſq; ad impletionem legis, nos donabit illis beneficiis quæ promittuntur legis obſervatoribus; imputando nimirum, nobis hanc alterius juſtitiam, quaſi etiam noſtra eſſet.*

(e) *Quemadmodum intuitu imputatæ ſatisfactionis, Deus nos liberat ab ira & pœna, quaſi nos illam ſatisfactionem in propriis perſonis exhibuiſſemus; Sic intuitu legis à Chriſto pro nobis impletæ acceptat nos ad vitam & præmium gloriæ, quaſi nos noſtrâ perſonali juſtitiâ legem impleviſſemus.*

(f) *Inſtrumentalem ſemper agnoſcit, non autem formalem: niſi quatenus ſub nomine fidei includit objectum fide comprehenſum. Quaſi diceret, Chriſti obedientiam fide apprehenſam eſſe cauſam formalem Juſtificationis noſtræ.*

the

the instrument. So also *Determinat.* 37. *pag.* 165. (g) *We attribute,* saith he, *this instrumentall power of justification to this trust in Christ the Mediator, rather then to any other act of sinning man; because it is manifest, that men are justified that way, by which the glory of God may be most illustrated, and the honour of our salvation given to God alone. But they that affirm that man is justified by other vertues or works, do not leave the whole glory of man's savation, in justification, alone to God, but ascribe some part unto themselves.*

You are highly displeased with all those, that will have no other condition of our justification, at the day of judgement, then affiance in Christ's righteousnes. If you allow faith to begin it, yet you will have works, at any hand, to perfect it. Here he is as full as anywhere against you. Quoting two passages out of *Hilary*, Chap. 29. p. 377. Of which we may make use anon, he thus expresseth himself. (h) *Jesuites are wont to ascribe justification to faith, but not to faith alone:* Hilary *taxes this error, when he saith,* Faith alone justifies: *They attribute,* saith he, *the beginning of justification to faith, but not the consummation: But* Hilary *far otherwise;* Faith consummates the just.

(g) *Huic fiduciæ in Christum mediatorem tribuimus instrumentalem vim justificandi, potius quam illi actui hominis peccatoris, Quia constat eo modo justificari homines, quo gloria divina maximè illustretur, & honor salutis nostræ ad solum Deum referatur. Atqui ab aliis virtutibus aut operibus statuunt hominem justificari, in justificationis negotio gloriam salutis humanæ*

(h) *Solent Jesuitæ justificationem fidei ascribere, sed non solo. Hunc errorem taxat Hilarius, quando dicit, Sola fides justificat. Initium etiam justificationis fidei tribuunt, sed non consummationem: At ille longè aliter, justum fides consummat.*

We have heard your sense of the danger of that opinion, That faith in Christ, as giving himself in Satisfaction for us, is alone the justifying act: And we shall hear how confident you are, that all antiquity is against it, as against the instrumentality of faith in justification, and the interest of works as consummate in judgement. If you please to read *Davenants* 37. Determinat. You shall see him as fully against you, as *Chemnitius*, *Amesius*, *Prideaux*, *Bernard*, *Anselmus*, or any other, that you can look upon, as your greatest adversaries. My third argument to assert this position (laid down Sect. 2. of this Postscript) he there makes his first, which I saw not till I was come hither, else I might have made other use of it. And see how he expresses himself, pag. 164. (i) *Now, as to that speciall, & proper object, at which faith looks, in that very instant, in which it receives justification from God, it is certain, that the guilty soul can not*

(i) *Jam quod spectat ad proprium illud & speciale objec-*

not find remiſſion of ſins in the hiſtoricall narrative of creation, or providence. Whence Aquinas, *In the juſtification of a ſinner, it is not neceſſary that other articles be thought upon, but that God be thought upon pardoning ſin. And in the commands and threats of the Law this ſpeciall object is much leſs found; For this conſideration begets nothing elſe, but terrors, &c. Therefore the ſweet Evangelicall promiſes of the favour and free pardon of ſin, by, and for the mediatour, onely remain, upon which whil'ſt faith looks, the ſinner conceives hope, relies upon this mediator, offered to him, yields himſelf to divine mercy for juſtification, and thereby attains the benefit of juſtification.* And this he backs with three Arguments.

jectum in quod fides reſpicit eo ipſo articulo quo accipit juſtificationem à Deo, certum eſt in hiſtoricâ narratione creationis aut gubernationis non poſſe animam ream invenire hanc peccatorum remiſſionem. Unde Aquinas, *In ipſâ juſtificatione peccatoris, non eſt neceſſe ut cogitentur cæteri articuli, ſed ſolum cogitetur Deus peccata remittens. Deinde in mandatis & comminationibus legis multo minùs invenitur hoc ſpeciale objectum: Nam talis conſideratio ex ſe nihil gignit quam terrores &c. Reſtant igitur dulces promiſſiones Evangelicæ de favore & gratuitâ peccati remiſſione per & propter Mediatorem, in quas dum fides reſpicit, peccator fiduciam concipit, in hunc oblatum ſibi Mediatorem recumbit, divinæ miſericordiæ ſe juſtificandum ſubjicit, atque inde juſtificationis beneficium protinùs conſequitur.*

You tell me, *Apol.* p. 24. *It muſt needs be known, that the faith which is the juſtifying condition is terminated on Chriſt himſelf as the object, and not on his Righteouſneſs which he gives in remiſſion.* Giving in your reaſons; To which in their due place I have ſpoke: And you may ſee *Davenant* as full againſt you here, as any where, *ca.* 23 *de Juſtit. habit.* p. 317. (k) *We are ſaid to receive this gift by the hand of faith, which applies to us* [*the righteouſneſs of Chriſt*;] *not that it ſhould be made ours by way of infuſion, or inheſion; but by way of imputation. And I wonder,* (ſaith he) *that Papiſts cannot underſtand how* [*the righteouſneſs of Chriſt*] *is applied to us by faith, who think that they underſtand, how by the Popes indulgencies, the merits of Chriſt, and the Saints, are applied to the quick and dead.* As alſo *chap.* 28. p. 371. (l) *There is nothing more uſual, then to aſcribe that to the cauſe applying, which properly and immediately belongs to the thing applyed. Therefore, becauſe faith apprehends and applies* [*the righteouſneſs of Chriſt*] *to us, that is attributed to faith, that indeed is due to Chriſt.* Where we plainly ſee, that according to him, Faith applies the righte-

(k) *Accipere autem dicimur hoc donum manu fidei, quæ applicat nobis Chriſti juſtitiam, non ut noſtra fiat per modum infuſionis aut inhæſionis, ſed per modum imputationis. Atque demiror Papiſtas non poſſe intelligere quomodo per fidem Chriſti juſtitia nobis applicetur, qui putant ſe intelligere quo modo per indulgentias Pontificias Chriſti & ſanctorum merita ſive vivis ſive mortuis aſſignentur.* (l) *Nihil uſitatius quam cauſæ applicanti illud tribuere quod propriè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Quia igitur fides apprehendit & applicat nobis Chriſti juſtitiam, id fidei ipſi tribuitur quod reipſa Chriſto debetur.*

ouſneſs

ousnes of Christ, and that it is an applying cause, and what cause except instrumentall, I cannot imagine. Much more might be brought out of this Reverend Author to this purpose. But this is enough to let us see, that there is not any so fair, and full accord between you. And if I should be put to name two writers of note, much differing one from the other in one particular subject, I think I should first mention Bp. *Davenant*, and Mr. *Richard Br.* in the point of justification. Your Reader may well judge, that he is amongst those that you say, (*Confes. pag.* 459.) you may safely, and boldly advise, all those that love the everlasting happines of their souls, that they take heed of. Where you warn all such, *that they take heed of their doctrine, who make the meer receiving of, that is, affiance in, the righteousnesse of Christ, to be the sole condition of their first justification, excluding Repentance, and the reception of Christ as a Teacher, and King, and Head, and Husband, from being any condition of it, yea, and will have no other condition of our justification at judgement; who call that affiance only by the name of justifying faith, and all other acts by the name of works.* And as to that which you here assert, *that he speaks as much as you, for the interest of works in justification*, you may conceit it, but those that have perused him, will hardly be induced to assent to it. Why is it then that he admits no other condition in the Covenant, then faith only? (*m*) *In this Covenant*, (saith he, *cap.* 30. *de Justit. act. pag.* 396) *there is no other condition, then that of true faith, required to obtain Reconciliation, Justification, and life eternall.* And having quoted, *Rom.* 3. 16. *Rom.* 4. 5. *Gal.* 3. 8. he adds, *Justification therefore, and right to life eternall is suspended upon condition of faith alone: But good works are also required of justified men, not to constitute a state of justification, or demerit life eternall; but to yield obedience, and testifie thankfulnes towards God, who justified us freely, and hath markt out that way for their walk, whom he hath designed for the kingdome of glory.* How is it

(m) *In hoc fœdere ad obtinendam reconciliationem, justificationem, atque æternam vitam, non alia requiritur conditio, quàm vera & viva fidei.*

(n) *Justificatio igitur, & jus ad æternam vitam ex conditione solius fidei suspenditur. Sed ab hominibus jam justificatis opera etiam bona exiguntur, non ad constituendum statum justificationis, aut promerendam vitam æternam: sed ad exhibendam obedientiam, & testificandum gratitudinem erga Deum, qui nos gratuitò justificavit, atque ad ambulandum in illâ viâ quam ad regnum gloriæ designatis ipse delineavit.*

Hæc gratia (ſc. inhærens) ut ſæpe dictum eſt, eſt appendix ſive conſequens gratuitæ juſtificationis.

then, *that again and again* (as he ſays) *himſelf hath ſaid, that it is but an Appendix or conſequence of Juſtification*, pag. 317? If he thus intereſt works in Juſtification, how he will be reconciled to himſelf, where in the paſſage before quoted he ſays, that *They that affirme that man is Juſtified by other vertues, or works, do not leave the whole glory of Mans ſalvation, in Juſtification, alone to God; but aſcribe ſome part to themſelves?* And in all that you quote out of him, *Pag.* 319, &c. to *Pag.* 326. how little is there that looks this way? You think you have juſt cauſe to charge contradictions upon the Reverend Author of the firſt, and ſecond part of Juſtification; Becauſe, having delivered that very doctrine which here is held forth out of *Davenant*, concerning the imputation of Chriſts active obedience (in which they ſcarce differ in termes) yet afterwards adds, *Though holy works do not juſtifie, yet by them a man is continned in a ſtate and condition of Juſtification: So that, did not the Covenant of grace interpoſe, groſſe and wicked waies would cut off our Juſtification, and put us in a ſtate of condemnation.* If you can reconcile *Davenant* to *Davenant*, which I doubt not may be done, this Author may then be as eaſily reconciled to himſelf. Paſſages of this kind only, you quote out of *Davenant*, which are as much oppoſite to himſelf, as to the Author now mentioned.

SECT. VI.

Unbelief and Impenitence in profeſſed Chriſtians are violations of the Covenant of Grace.

THe next you enter upon is, a Query, *How far unbelief and impenitence in profeſſed Chriſtians are violations of the new Covenant*: Oppoſing your ſelf againſt that Poſition of mine, *Chap.* 33. *Pag.* 245. [That men in impenitency and unbelief, that lie in ſin, and live in the neglect of the Sacrifice of the blood of Chriſt, live in a continuall breach of Covenant] Here you confeſſe that I *cite no words of yours*, and therefore you are uncertain whether it is intended againſt you. To which I ſay, that it is intended againſt all that deny what in the Poſition is aſſerted:

asserted; which you seem to do, *Aphor. Thes.* 34. *Pag.* 163. Where you say, *That the Covenant of grace is not properly said be violated, or its conditions broken, except they be finally broken.* But before I enter upon the thing it self, give me leave to assume thus much out of your own mouth; That men in finall unbelief and impenitency are in Covenant with God; This is clear; They that break Covenant, and render themselves properly guilty of the violation of it, are in Covenant. The breach of promise presupposes making of a promise, and breach of Covenant presupposes entrance into Covenant, *Jer.* 34. 18. The Lord threatneth those that transgressed his Covenant, and had not performed the words of his Covenant: And those that thus transgressed Covenant, did likewise, as wee see there, enter into Covenant: But these as you affirm, break Covenant, and render themselves properly guilty of violation of the conditions of it: Therefore it follows, that they are in Covenant. And, as the Covenant is, that they transgresse; such the Covenant is, that they enter; They do not enter one Covenant, and transgresse another; They transgresse a reall, and not equivocall, halfe-erring Covenant: It is therefore a reall, and not an equivocall, halfe-erring Covenant that they enter. And as this clearly follows from hence; so from your position that immediatly goes before it, [*That Christs passive obedience and merit was only to satisfie for the violation of the Covenant of works, but not at all for the violation of the Covenant of grace*] it clearly follows, That there is no universall Redemption by Christs Death or satisfaction. If Christ died not for satisfaction of their sin, that stand guilty of the breach of the Covenant of grace, then he died not for the sins of all: This is clear. But, according to you, he died not to make satisfaction for their sin, that thus stand guilty; Therefore he died not for the sins of all. Yea it will follow, that he dyed for the lesser part only, of those that make profession of his name: Seeing the greater part die in impenitency, and unbelief. Yea, it will follow, that he dyed for the Elect only; For Faith and repentance are proper to the Elect: All others die in impenitency and unbelief. I do not here go about to dispute the thing, but only observe, that all that *Amyraldus* hath gone about to set up, concerning universall Redemption, with such high applause of yours, is by this position utterly overthrown. For the assertion which

Men in finall unbelief and impenitency in Covenant with God.

Universall Redemtion overthrown.

which in the place mentioned I have laid down, that [impenitence and unbelief in profeſſed Chriſtians is a breach of Covenant] I need ſay no more, then that which I have ſpoke, there having been nothing replyed to that which I have ſaid. My argnment in the place quoted, in brief was this; [They that engage in Covenant to believe in Chriſt, and forſake their ſin, break Covenant by a life in unbelief, and ſin: But all profeſſed Chriſtians engage by Covenant to believe in Chriſt, and to forſake their ſin: Therefore all profeſſed Chriſtians, by unbelief and ſin, break Covenant] I only here add, If unbelief and impenitence be not breaches or violations of Covenant properly ſo called, then finall unbelief and impenitence is no breach or violation of Covenant properly ſo called. This is clear. Finall perſeverance in unbelief and impenitence is no more, then a continuance of the ſame poſture or ſtate of Soul Godward, in which they before ſtood, in impenitence and unbelief; As Perſeverance in Faith and Repentance, is the continuance of Faith and Repentance. If then finall unbelief and impenitence be a breach of the Covenant of grace, then all unbelief and impenitence, denominating a man, an unbelieving and impenitent perſon, is a breach of Covenant likewiſe. For the clearing of your meaning, which is all that you do in this queſtion, you diſtinguiſh, firſt of the word [*Covenant:*] Secondly, of the word, [*Violation.*] You ſay, *The word* [*Covenant*] *is ſometimes taken for Gods Law made to his creature, containing precepts, promiſes, and threatnings: Sometimes for man's promiſe to God.* [*Violation,*] You ſay, *is taken, either rigidly for one that in judgement is eſteemed a non-performer of the condition, or laxly, for one that in judgement is found a true performer of the condition, but did neglect, or refuſe the performance for a time.* You apply both theſe diſtinctions: *Taking the word Covenant in the latter ſenſe,* you ſay that you *have affirmed, that man breaks many a Covenant with God: yea even the Baptiſmal vow it ſelf, is ſo broken, till men do truly repent, and believe.* To which I reply, That it is no other then the Baptiſmall vow, or Covenant, that we are to enquire into. Baptiſme is, as Circumciſion was, a ſeal of the Covenant: In Baptiſme then we engage to the terms of the Covenant, and till we repent and believe, by your own confeſſion, we break this Covenant. *But taking the word* [*Covenant*] ſay you, *in the former ſenſe,* i. e. *for Gods precepts, promiſes,*

Arguments evincing that impenitence and unbelief in profeſſed Chriſtians are violations of Covenant.

Explicatory diſtinctions examined.

miſes and threatnings, and [*Violation*] *in the latter ſenſe, for one that in Judgment* (that is at the day of Judgment) *is eſteemed a non performer of the conditions,* ſo, you ſay, *None violate the Covenant but finall Unbelievers and impenitent, that is,* (as you explaine it) *No other are the proper ſubject of its peremptory curſe or threatning.* But Good Sir, reflect upon this explanation of yours, and in a more ſerious way, yet conſider of it. To help your ſelf out; you refer *mans violation* of Covenant, not to his own *promiſe or engagement,* in which he ſtands in duty tyed, but to *Gods engagements,* containing his promiſes and threatnings, and to violate Gods promiſe or threatning, (which you here implye to be done by Covenant-breakers) ſcarce carries ſenſe with it. We may incur his threatning, or miſſe of his promiſe; but we do not violate either his promiſe or threatning. Violation of Gods precept is diſobedience, of which *Pharaoh,* a man never in Covenant, was guilty, but no violation or breach of Covenant, where there is no voluntary engagement. Our engagement is neceſſary to make it up into a Covenant, and our violation of our engagements, to make it a breach of Covenant. Was ever any charged with breach of Covenant, in breaking not his own, but the condition of the other Conanting party? *Iſrael* was under a Law to let their *Hebrew* Servants go free, the ſeaventh year, *Exod.* 21. 2. In *Zedekiah's* time, they ſerv'd themſelves of them beyond that terme. Here was the tranſgreſſion of a Law, but no breach of any particular Covenant. But when they entred Covenant with God to do that which Law required, and ratified it by cutting a Calfe in twaine, paſſing through the parts of it; and again, ſerved themſelves of them; here was a breach of Covenant.

So that the violation that you ſpeak of (if you may call it a violation) is no Covenant-violation. Every man that breaks a Covenant, breaks his own, and not anothers part, in the Covenant.

Impenitent perſons in the moſt ſtrict and proper ſenſe are Covenant-breakers.

And whereas you will have that to be a violation of Covenant, laxly, and not rigidly taken, when one doth neglect or refuſe the performance for the time, but in judgment (that is in the day of Judgment) is found a true performer of the conditions; to me it is very ſtrange, upon a ſeverall account. Firſt, I ſuppoſe you mean his own conditions to which he ſtandes engaged, which for a time he thus neglects, and not

Gods; And you ſo ſpoile all that before you ſpake of Covenant-violations, reſpective to promiſes and threatnings. Secondly, Such a one, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, is a man guilty of breach of Covenant during ſuch time of his neglect or refuſall. Was not that younger Son of his Father, mentioned *Luk.*15. properly and in the moſt rigid ſenſe, a prodigal, when he waſted his ſubſtance with ritotous living, notwithſtanding that he was after reclaimed to a more frugall courſe? And was not ſhee alſo that was a ſinner in the City, *Luk.*7. truly a ſinner, or only in a laxe ſenſe, becauſe ſhe afterwards repented? Was not the penitent Thief, as truly, and in as rigid a ſenſe, a Thief, when he ſtole, as he that ſtole and repented not? And ſo he that lives in breach of promiſe with God, is as truly a breaker of Covenant, notwithſtanding following Repentance, as thoſe that live and die impenitent. I know therefore, no other way of explanation of your ſelf to your Readers ſatisfaction, but to ſay, that the Covenant of grace is not finally violated unleſſe the conditions be finally broke. Who ever doubted, but when a ſinner repents, the doom which is paſſed againſt him for ſin, is reverſt? And that *Paul* a perſecutor, not in a laxe, but in rigid ſenſe, afterwards building the faith that he deſtroyed, ſhall not appear in Judgment as a perſecutor. And ſo he that is, as truly and in no laxe ſenſe, a Covenant-breaker, being by grace brought in to keep Covenant in the day of Judgment ſhall be reputed and eſteemed a man faithful in Covenant.

SECT. VII.

Faith and Repentance are mans conditions, and not Gods, in the proper conditionall Covenant.

THE next in order in which I am ſpoken unto, is, that which *Sect.* 55. *Pag.* 108. you fall upon, Entituling it, [*Whether Faith, and Repentance be Gods works?*] Where having repeated words of mine out of *Chap.*15. *Pag.*101. of the Treatiſe of the Covenant, ſomewhat largely, but very brokenly, you are pleaſed to ſay, Mr. *Bls. buſineſſe here is to refute the anſwer that I gave to that objection.* The objection was thus put by

by one, that excepted against your Aphorismes. [How make you Faith and Repentance, to be the conditions of the Covenant on our part, seeing the bestowing of them is part of the condition on Gods part? Can they be Gods conditions and ours too?] To which I answered (which in part you transcribe) [In case these two cannot stand together, that they should be conditions, both Gods and ours, we may answer by way of retortion: And am I sure we have the better end of the staffe, that they are our conditions; they are conditions on our part, therefore they cannot be Gods: That they are ours is made known of God, as by the beame of the Sun in his word. And I shall not stand to distinguish of an absolute and conditionall Covenant, and so making the whole in the absolute Covenant to be Gods, and in the conditionall, this part to be ours (which I know not whether exactly understood the Scripture will bear) but in plain termes, deny them to be the Gods conditions, and affirme them to be ours] In all which I can confidently speak that I never had it in my thoughts to oppose you; yea, I assuredly expected, that how many adversaries soever I should find, yet I should have had you here, on my party. My confidence herein was upon these grounds. 1. In that you have shewed your self so well pleased with that which I had spoke in my answer to Mr. *Tombs*, for explanation of that text of *Jeremiah* after quoted; as may be seen *Pag.* 224. of your Treatise of *Infant-Baptisme:* and I am sure there is nothing here to crosse any thing that I had spoken there: Shewing your self then so far my friend, I could not imagine, that persisting in the same, I should have had you to be my Adversary. 2. In that you had plainly enough (to my understanding) declared your self against any such thing as absolute promises, *Aphor. Pag.* 8, 9. in these words: *Those promises of taking the hard heart out of us, and giving us hearts of flesh, &c. are generally taken to be absolute promises*; and after some more words, you infer, *Therefore these absolute promises are but meere gratious predictions, what God will do for his Elect, the comfort whereof can be received by no man, till the benefit be received, and they be to him fulfilled: Therefore as all meer predictions, so also these promises, do fall under the will of purpose, and not of precept.* And Commenting on those words of the Prophet, as applyed by the Apostle, *Heb.* 8 you say, Appen. Pag. 42. *Whether the Apostle mention it as an absolute*

Grounds on which the Author was confident that Mr. *Br.* herein was on his party.

promiſe is a great doubt; and having yeelded ſo far as to ſay, *I think you may call it an abſolute promiſe*, you caution this freedome of calling it ſo, very largely, *Pag.* 43. And then you make all up in theſe words, So that I conclude, *that it is moſt properly, but a prophecie what God will do*, de eventu; *as it hath reference to the parties on whom it ſhall be fulfilled; and ſo is the revealing part of Gods purpoſing will, and belongeth not at all to his preceptive or legiſlative will, by which he doth govern, and will judge the world.* And that Gods Covenant and promiſes properly ſo called belong to his preceptive and legiſlative will, whereby he governes the world, and not to his purpoſing will, (according to you) is manifeſt. 3. You have appeared at large & with much zeal for the conditionality of the Covenant on mans part, and that it is not made alone with Chriſt, but Chriſtians; with conditions impoſed on them, but not on him. And how this can be, when thoſe are Gods conditions and not mans, I cannot ſee. If Faith and Repentance be Gods conditions and not mans. Where is there any conditions on mans part remaining? 4. Summing up your anſwer to your *Queriſts* 6. and 7. queſtion, you ſay, *Now I hope you can hence anſwer to both your own demands. To the ſeaventh, You ſee there is a Covenant abſolute, and a Covenant conditionall; but the laſt is the proper Goſpel-Covenant. To the ſixth, You ſee that in the abſolute Covenant or prophecie, he promiſeth Faith and Repentance (in promiſing his Spirit and a new heart) to the Elect, who are, we know not who. And in the conditionall proper Covenant, he requireth the ſame Faith and Repentance of us, if we will be ſaved: So that they are Gods part which he hath diſcovered that he will performe in one Covenant, and they are made our conditions in another.* And you very well know, that I ſpeak of the conditionall, proper Covenant, or elſe why do I contend for conditions in it? and in this Covenant of which we ſpeak, you ſay, they are required of us, and are our conditions. And for the other Covenant, where you ſay that they are Gods part, which he hath diſcovered that he will performe, ſee how full I come up to you, *Chap.* 9. *Pag.* 64. of my Treatiſe, where I ſay, [I ſuppoſe they may be more fitly called, the declaration or indication of Gods work in the conditions to which he ingageth, and of the neceſſary concurrence of the power of his grace, in that which he requireth] So that, had you had no more mind to have

have been upon contradiction of me, then I of you, we had here ſhaken hands together, and not lift up our hands one againſt the other. You ſay, Section 38. pag. 37. that *you are uncertain whether my 33. Chapt. be againſt you, becauſe I recite no words of yours*, though it be indeed full againſt your opinion. Here, *I* think, *I* recite no words of yours, neither did *I*, as *I* thought, oppoſe any opinion of yours; Yet you ſay, my buſineſs is to confute your anſwer. You ſay, *A brief reply may ſatisfie this confutation*, And *I* ſay, [*No r ply*] would have been more fit for [*no confutation.*] You acquaint me how you explain'd your ſelf, *plainly ſhewing that the thing called* [*God's condition*] *was not preciſely the ſame with that called* [*ours.*] *Ours was, Believing and repenting, Gods is, The beſtowing of theſe, as the queſtion expreſſed. Anſw. I* think you ſhould have made the difference far more wide. Our conditions in this conditional proper Covenant, are faith and repentance, to theſe we are called (as you ſay,) if we will be juſtified and ſaved. God's conditions in this conditionall proper Covenant, are thoſe to which he engages himſelf, *viz. rewards*, in caſe of Covenant-keeping, and *puniſhments*, in caſe of Covenant-breaking; One he promiſes, the other he threats: and theſe we expect, or fear, according as we anſwer in Covenant-keeping, or fail, through breach of it Herein *I* explained my ſelf, Chap. 5. pag. 21. and this ſure was your mind, when you wrote your Aphoriſmes, where you ſay, *Faith and Repentance are Gods part, that he will perform in one Covenant, and made our conditions in another.* The beſtowing of them, then, is no condition of God in that Covenant where they are conditions required from us. You ſay in a Parentheſis (if I underſtand you) *that our action of believing is called Gods condition by the Queriſt, though improperly, yet in a language very common in* Mr. *B's Treatiſe.* I deſire inſtances to make this appear, that it is thus common in my Treatiſe. You ſay, *Thus much being premiſed, I reply more particularly, 1. I will yet ſay, that God hath ſuch an abſolute promiſe as well as a conditionall, till you give me better reaſons of your deniall, or your queſtioning whether Scripture will bear it. Anſw.* It ſeems you perceive that I do not plainly deny it; I have reaſons ſo far preponderating at leaſt, that I dare not aſſert it; I ſhall adventure upon one that makes towards a denial. Meer gracious predictions, or prophecies *de eventu*, what God will

Arguments offered againſt an abſolute Covenant.

will do, are no abſolute promiſes, how generally ſoever ſo taken. This I think is plain. There is a difference betwixt a meer prediction and a promiſe, or a prophecie *de eventu*, what God will do, and a promiſe. But theſe that are generally taken to be abſolute promiſes, are, (according to you) *meer gracious predictions what God will do*, Aphor. pag. 9. *Prophecies* de eventu, *what God will do*, Append. pag. 44. *Ergo.* I ſhall adventure to ſecond it with another. Promiſes properly ſo called, have ſome determinate object, to whom they are made, and who may receive conſolation from them. This appears, *Heb.* 6. 17, 18. But in theſe abſolute promiſes generally ſo called, there is no determinate object to whom they are made, or that poſſibly can receive conſolation from them. This is plain. *They are made* (as you ſay) *to the Elect and being made to them, they are made*, (as you further ſay) *to, we know not who*, and ſo none can receive conſolation from them. *No man can aforehand ſay*, (as you obſerve,) *that he ſhall have a new and ſoft heart, becauſe God hath promiſed it: For he cannot know that it is promis'd to him*; Therefore theſe are no promiſes properly ſo called. You adde, *I ſhall yet ſay, that the giving of our faith and Repentance is the matter of that abſolute promiſe. Anſw.* That it is the matter of that, which you have called [Gods prediction, or prophecie *de eventu*, what ſhall fall out,] and now do call an [abſolute promiſe,] I do eaſily grant: And ſo, according to your ſelf, it is not the matter of the conditionall proper Covenant of which we ſpeak, which is enough for me againſt you in the thing in queſtion. You further ſay, *my argument to the contrary, hath little in it to compell you to a change. Anſw.* My argument, it ſeems, found you changed: I cannot ſee you the ſame here, as, at leaſt I thought, I ſaw you in your Aphoriſms. *Your Major*, (ſay you) *is, Whoſe acts they are, his conditions they are.* In your reply, you ſeem to grant it, underſtood negatively, but *affirmatively*, (you ſay) *the propoſition holds not univerſally*, but put not in your exception. But afterwards you put in an exception, as underſtood negatively; *Nor negatively do's it hold*, (ſay you,) *ſpeaking* de actione quæ eſt quid donandum. *Anſw.* I think it holds nothing leſs then if there be *quid agendum*, as well as *quid dandum*, in caſe the action be matter of duty. You ſay further, *to your Minor, I could better anſwer, if I could find it.* Expecting, (ſay you,) that it ſhould have been this, *But our faith*

and

and Repentance are not Gods acts; And obſerving that I ſay, That *this* riſes not to make them formally Gods acts, and not ours, leaving out all that, to which the Relative [This] refers, you know beſt for what reaſon. Your Reader may ſuſpect, That it is to perſwade, that I deny, (which ſeems your great deſign here) that God hath any hand in it. I was cenſured before for giving too much to the Spirit of God, in the work of Sanctification; when I would have the denomination to be given to him, and not to man in that work: And here I am brought in, as aſcribing nothing to Gods Spirit, becauſe I ſeem to ſay, that Faith and Repentance are mans acts and not Gods: Where you further except againſt me, as over cautelous in ſpeaking the two propoſitions copulatively. *It is enough, you ſay, to prove them Gods conditions, and ours, if they be Gods actions and ours*; Which will be, I think, a diſproof (if it be once made good) of that which in your anſwer to your Queriſts, you have ſaid; where you ſay, *That they are Gods part that he hath diſcovered that he will perform in one Covenant, and they are made our conditions in another.* They are not then Gods conditions and ours in the ſame Covenant: I am well enough content, that you make them God's conditions, and not ours, in the improper unconditionate Covenant, ſo that you will grant, that they are our conditions and not Gods, in the proper conditionate Covenant, of which we now ſpeak. When I ſay that this riſes not to make them formally Gods acts, and not ours, You ſay the word [formally] may do much to help me *out*; And I ſay it is well that I have ſome help that way, for I fear your great deſign here is to hedge me *in*; or elſe you had not oppoſed me, where my buſineſs is not to oppoſe, but to defend you, And here you come in with an objection to purpoſe. It is hard to know whether your [formally] reſpect a *natural*, or *moral* form; Where we have Logick niceties enow: But to let theſe paſs: I think no man but your ſelf, would have mentioned *nature*, or *morality* here. My meaning is only, that, *formali modo loquendi*, they have their denomination from man, and not from God. You further obſerve, that I ſay, They are our acts, &c. God believes not, &c. Yielding that *to believe is our act*; you object, that *to move us effectually to believe, as a ſuperior cauſe, is not our work, but Gods. Anſw.* Sure you do not think, that ever I thought, that the work of a ſuperior cauſe above man, is the work

work of man: And you may plainly ſee, that I ſpeak as much, in words that you leave out, for God's more ſuperior cauſality in this work, as you do. You ſay, *Let it be ſo, to believe, is our work, and our condition; It follows not, that it is not Gods.* But me thinks this neceſſarily follows. I never heard, that in any bargain, the condition of the one party, was the condition of the other. And your Reader will think, that you have here much forgot your ſelf, having in this very page ſaid, *The condition is his that performeth it, not his that impoſeth it*; And *I* am ſure that God impoſeth, and we perform the conditions of Faith and Repentance, therefore they are not his conditions but ours. You ſay, *There are ſufficient reaſons why God is ſaid not to believe, though he cauſe us to believe.* If you pleaſe to produce theſe reaſons, I ſhall he artily thank you. I have ſaid plainly enough, that God cauſes us to believe, & deni'd that he is properly ſaid to believe. Your reaſons then muſt needs be acceptable. You tell me of *Prædeterminants* and their Adverſaries, *Jeſuites, Arminians*: All of which acknowledge God to be the cauſe of u' acts: And I acknowledge the ſame, and ſo far there is a faire and friendly accord. But you ſay, *I adventure a ſtep farker, and ſay, that faith and repentance are mans work, and not Gods.* To which you reply, 1. *What meane you then to yeeld afterward, that God worketh all our works in us? Thoſe which he worketh are ſure his works.* *Anſw.* What need you to aske that queſtion, when I there explaine mine own meaning? Your argument *à conjugatis*, [What God worketh, is his work] muſt have its due limits, or elſe you will run into many abſurdities. God works our motion from place to place, and yet he himſelf does not move. The text it ſelf by me quoted, gives an anſwer. Having aſſerted that God works them, the denomination is ſtill given to man: God works all *our* works in us: when he has wrought them they are yet ſaid to be *ours*. I freely ſubſcribe to that of *Eſtius* upon the words, *Deus omne bonum, ac totum, ab initio bonæ voluntatis, uſque ad conſummationem boni operis, in nobis efficaciter operatur, ordine, ſc. cauſalitatis.* You adde, *I never met with any* Orthodox Divine, *but would yeeld that Faith is a work of Gods Spirit, and the Spirits work is doubtleſs Gods work*: Farther telling me, *If you go the Common way of the* Prædeterminants, *you muſt acknowledge that God is the Phyſicall Efficient, Prædetermining, Principall, Immediate cauſe of eve-*

ry

ry act of every creature, and therefore doubtlesse, of our Faith; and that both immediatione virtutis & suppositi; *So that it is more properly his act then ours.* Here you furnish me with an answer. Though in the highest way of *Predeterminants*, I should ascribe all in every act to God, yet they are not Gods works or acts in a rigid proper sense, but by a Metonymie of the cause. He works them, because he works us for the acting of them, and so I explained my self, We are his *workmanship, fitted and prepared for good works.* Christ was the principall efficient when he raised *Lazarus*; yet it was *Lazarus* and not Christ that did rise. Concerning acts of this nature, that we are upon, I believe, that *Quod voluntas agit, liberè agit, interim ex naturâ non est libera ad bonum, sed per gratiam liberata: libera in radice, non in termino. Homo denuò natus vult & perficit quod est bonum; Deus autem operatur & velle & perficere ordine* sc. *causalitatis.* You profess your self of *Bp. Davenants* mind, who saith, *As for the predetermination of mens wills, it is a controversie between the* Dominicans *and* Jesuits, *with whose Metaphysicall speculations, our* Protestant *Divines love not to torture their brains, or at least should not.* Declaring your self, that you *take it to be a poynt beyond the knowledge of any man, which way God works on the will in these respects:* In uch marvaile then that you will so much trouble your Reader about it. You tell us, that if you *must incline to any way, it would be rather to* Durandus, *for stronger reasons then you find in* Ludovicus à Dola, *who yet* (you say) *hath more then you have seen well answered.* And yet perhaps *à Dola*, in case he had seen your arguments, would have judged his as strong as yours, Notwithstanding your great abilities to give answer to them, when all others that you have seene, have been wanting. So farr as I have looked into the Author, I see him a man of much modesty, and one in whome reason is not wanting, though I will not undertake to declare either with, or against him. When I say [Our dexterity for holy duties is from the frame into which grace puts us, and so still the work is ours, though power for action is vouchsafed of God] You reply, *Both* velle *and* perficere *are the gift of God, and not only*, posse velle, & perficere. To which I say I had thought, that Power for action, had included that which you say, and not denyed it, namely a powerfull inclination of the will to the work. *Thy people shall be willing*

willing in the day of thy power, Psal. 110.3. The will is still mans, when grace has wrought him up to it. I had thought there had been no such danger in *Paules* words, *Phil.* 4. 13. *I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me.* You conclude, that *I have not confuted your answer*, namely *to your Quærists question*, when indeed I never intended it, and if I would now go about it, I need not, finding it (as I think) done to my hand. You give in your reason, 1. *That I have not disproved the absolute promise of the first speciall Grace. Answ.* You say no more of this, in your reply to your Querist, that I can find, but *Whether the Apostle mention it as an absolute promise, is a great doubt, and that you think we may call it an absolute promise*; when you had said before, that they are *meer gratious predictions.* 2. These supposed promises, as you say in your answer, are not within the proper conditionall Covenant, and therefore I had nothing to do with it. 2. You further say, *that I have not disproved God to be the Author of our faith, so as that it is his work. Answ.* I do not find that in all your answer, and you most unfairely make the title of this Section, to be [*Whether Faith and Repentance are Gods works*] My businesse was against your Querist, affirming them to be Gods conditions not ours. 3. You say, *If I had; yet Believing, which is our work is not the same with giving faith, or moving us to believe, which is Gods work. Answ.* This I confesse; You did not affirme it before, that, I know, and I yeeld it now. The former is ours, *viz.* to believe, the latter, Gods, *viz.* to give Faith, or move us to believe. A mighty proofe sure that your answer is not confuted if it had been intended, because I have gainsayed, what your answer never asserted. For that wich I intended not against you, but as I thought, for you, *That Faith and Repentance are our conditions, and not Gods, I thus further argue.*

Arguments evincing, that Faith and Repentance are our conditions and not Gods, in the proper conditionall Covenant.

Those conditions that are not mentioned in the proper conditionall Covenant, as from God, but required of God from us, are not Gods conditions, but ours, in that Covenant. This is cleare; Being there expresly required of us, and not so much as mentioned, as from God; they cannot be his engagement, but ours to performe. But Faith and Repentance are not mentioned as from God, in the proper conditionall Covenant, but required of God from us. This proposition is your

own

own in your answer, as we have heard before, *pag.* 45, 46. Therefore Faith and Repentance are not God's conditions in the proper conditionall Covenant, but ours.

2. The conditions of a Covenant are his that performeth, and not his that imposeth. This Proposition is your own in this Section, and clear in reason. But we perform, and God imposeth Faith and Repentance. This is of two parts; First, that they are performed by us, This you confess, where you yield that they are our acts. For the second, that they are imposed on us, none can deny, See 1 *John* 3. 23. *Act.* 17.30. They are therefore our conditions, and not God's, in this Covenant.

3. Covenant-conditions are theirs, that are charg'd with falshood in case of failing in them, and non-performance of them. This is plain in all Covenants: To make conditions, and to fail in them, is to be false to them. But in case of failing in Faith and Repentance, man is charged and not God. God fails not but man deals falsly. Therefore they are mans conditions, and not Gods.

4. Covenant-conditions are theirs, who upon failing in them, and not performance of them, suffer as Covenant-breakers. This is clear. *Israel* covenanted to dismis their Hebrew servants, and dismissed them not: And *Israel* suffered for it, *Jer.* 34. But upon failing in Faith and Repentance, God suffers not, so much as in his name. He is not charged with mens unbelief and impenitence: Men themselves suffer. Therefore Faith and Repentance are mans conditions, not God's. So that though I have not refuted your answer, which never was in my eye, yet I have answered your Queriſt's demand, and made it good, that Faith and Repentance are mans conditions, and not God's, in the Gospel-covenant.

SECT. VIII.

The Covenant of Grace requires and accepts sincerity.

I Have pass'd through those debates, in which our judgements stand at difference; for in the last you will differ,

though I had thought there had been a full accord between us. Now I must come to that in which we do agree, which pag. 144. Sect. 82. you entitle, [*Whether the Covenant of Grace require perfection, and accept sincerity?*] In which *I* take to the negative, conceiving that it requires the same that it accepts. And in your Aphorismes, if *I* understand any thing, you have clearly delivered your self with me, pag. 157, 158. in these words: *As when the old Covenant said, Thou shalt obey perfectly, the Moral Law did partly* (*I* think you mean perfectly) *tell them wherein they should obey: So when the new Covenant saith, Thou shalt obey sincerely, the Moral Law doth perfectly tell us wherein, or what we must endeavour to do, &c.* Whereupon Mr. *Crandon* is, herein against you, with as great vehemence as in any other of your doctrines. Neither do *I* perceive, by any thing that you have said, that your mind is changed: And *I* had much rather answer Mr. *Crandon* in defence of truth, which he, in you, here oppoſeth, then to spend time in my own quarrel. Though my Tenent give you not distast, yet it seems, my arguments do not please. But if truth stand, it matters less though *I* fall. You answer all my arguments in order, as though you judged me to be in the fowlest error; when *I* am yet perswaded, that if not onely some, but all of my arguments fail, which you make your business to impugn, the Position it self, (which with you is truth, as well as with me) will fall with it. After a short Apology, and conjecture made, who that Divine may be, whom with much reverence *I* mention, supposing him the first that manifested himself in the contrary way, that the Gospel requires perfection, and accepts sincerity, You tell me, that you conceive this difference is occasioned by the ambiguity of the word [Covenant of Grace:] and tell me, that in your judgement, *I ought to have removed it, by distinguishing, before I had argued against their opinion.* And so you fall upon my work for me, and give in abundance of acceptations of the word [Covenant of Grace.] And if *I* may take the boldness to be as free with you, as you with me, *I* think you might have done well to have made it appear, where, and by whom, this word is taken in all of these different senses, and significations. If your Reader knew all this, before your Book fell into his hand, you have nothing benefited him, you have only told him what he knew before: If he he knew it not, he hath now alone

alone your word for it. And *I* know not where elſe, any Reader may find a great part of it, but from your hand. *I* profeſs my ſelf to be much more amazed then edified in Reading all that you have ſpoke of it. When you have reckoned up very many ſenſes of the word, you ſay, Now if the queſtion be, whether in any of theſe ſenſes, the Covenant doth command perfect obedience? you anſwer, *All the doubt is of the three latter*, one of which is, *Promiſes*, *Prophecies*, *and Types*, *before Chriſt's comming*. And to ſpeak mine own meaning, (and *I* had thought, no man had doubted of it) *I* take Covenant of grace in this diſpute, for the whole tranſaction that paſſes, in a Covenant-way betwixt God and his people, in order to Salvation, as comprizing all that God requires, promiſes, or threats, and all that to which man engages himſelf, and which he expects. But when *I* ſpeak of that which the Covenant, thus taken, promiſeth; I mean that which it promiſeth in the promiſſory part of it: when I ſpeak of what it threatneth, I mean in the Minatory part of it: and when I ſpeak of what it requires, I mean in the preceptive part of it. Now this preceptive part muſt needs have ſome rule, at which men in Covenant muſt look, as diſtinguiſhed from threats or promiſes, and containing *Agenda*, things to be done, and not *Credenda*, *Speranda*, or *Timenda*, things to be *Believed*, *Hoped*, or *Feared*. The rule, or Standard here, in theſe things, which man in Covenant is called to do, is the Moral Law: God quits not man of his Subjection: He is a ſubject in this, as he was in the former Covenant. The Covenant of works called to the keeping of it in the higheſt, fulleſt, and moſt compleat perfection. The Covenant of Grace cals us to eye it, and with ſincere endeavour to conform to it. When God ſpake to *Abraham* (the leading man in Covenant reſpective to all after-Covenanters, whether Jewes, or Gentiles,) he ſaith, *I am the Almighty God, or God al-ſufficient, walk before me, and be thou perfect*, Gen. 17. 1. In which words, we have firſt the parties in Covenant, and the engagement of either party. Gods engagement is to be to *Abraham*, Almighty, and Al-ſufficient for protection, for proviſion, ſo that, he need not look elſe-where to compaſs good, or keep off evill. *Abrahams* Engagement is, to walk before God, and to be perfect, or, as it is in the Margent reading, *upright*, *ſincere*: which walking ſaith *Ainſworth*, comprehendeth both *true faith*, Heb. 11. 5, 6. and

An explication of the Authors meaning.

and *careſull obedience to God's Commandments.* That faith is called for in this perfection, ſee 2 *Chron.* 16. 8, 9. To rely alone upon God in one verſe, is to be perfect in the other. That this perfection of ſervice, or obedience, is no other then ſincerity, all interpreters that I have ſeen, acknowledge. See *Peter Martyr, Vatablus, Parœus, Calvin* on the place. *God Covenants for obedience,* (ſaith *Calvin*) *from his ſervant; and the integrity, which is here mentioned, is oppoſed* to hypocriſie. *Rivet* cloſeth with *Calvin,* and in many words expreſſeth himſelf, that this perfection means nothing elſe, but integrity, or ſincerity, otherwiſe (ſaith he) *they that walk, and are yet in the way, do not attain to a perfection properly ſo called.* So that according to him, the Covenant requires the ſame, that through grace the Saints here attain, and that is a perfection not properly ſo called. Dr. *Preſton* on the words is very large to this purpoſe. As for that which you produce as an opinion of an acquaintance, & friend of mine of extraordinary learning and judgement (leaving me to gueſs whom you mean, as indeed I do, but with poſſibility of miſtake) That the Morall Law is the matter of the new Covenant; I cannot well underſtand, at leaſt as you expreſs it. How far the word [matter] may reach, I know not. I believe, that it is their Rule in the New Covenant, but otherwiſe held out, then it was in the Covenant of works, as I have before expreſſed my ſelf. As a Law, it loſes nothing of it's ancient ſtrictneſs, for it is ever unchangeably the ſame; the rule of our duty, and not of our ſtrength; onely the terms of the Covenant of Grace, are not for *exact obſervation,* but *ſincere endeavour.* So that the leaſt failing is a ſin againſt the Law, but not a breach of Covenant; which for ought I diſcern is the ſenſe that you give. As for that which in the ſecond place you urge from him, whom you ſtile, *Learned, Judicious, and much Honoured Brother, and my friend and acquaintance*; making theſe two, but one Law *quo ad formam, I command thee ſal'n man, perfect obedience; and oblige thee to punniſhment for every ſin: yet not remedileſly, but ſo, as that if thou Believe and Repent, this obligation ſhall be diſſolved, & thou ſaved, elſe not.* I ſhould rather take them *disjunctim* then *conjunctim,* but *I* know not whether there be any conſiderable difference. *I* ſo far ſubſcribe, that all that periſh by the ſentence of the Law, to whom the Covenant was ever tendered, are by neglect of Covenant, left in a remedileſs

medileſs condition. The Law damns the unbeliever and impenitent: unbelief holds him, that he is not by the Covenant of Grace delivered from the Law's ſentence. When you come to bring all home, by application to me, with your cenſure for laying an heavy charge upon them that I oppoſe, and apologizing on their part; I do not well know how to underſtand your words, that ſo I might ſee my own error. You ſay, *It is moſt likely, that thoſe Divines that affirm, that the Covenant of Grace doth require perfect obedience, and accepts ſincere, do take that Covenant in this laſt and largeſt ſenſe, and as containing the Moral Law, as part of the matter.* Before you ſpake of the Moral Law, as the matter of the Covenant, and now you ſpeak of it, as part of the matter, *And ſo underſtood,* (you ſay) *No doubt it is true, if I underſtand it of perfection for the future.* And then doubtleſs it is an error, for I underſtand perfection for the preſent; And what the Law of God, or Covenant do's require, it doth in preſent, as I think, require: And what gave you occaſion to ſuſpect otherwiſe, I cannot imagin. When you have taken upon you their defence, or at leaſt their excuſe, that hold againſt you, you come to anſwer my arguments, that hold with you.

Arguments that the Covenant of grace requires onely ſincerity, vindicated.

I ſaid, [This opinion, That the Covenant requires perfection, eſtabliſhes the former opinion oppoſed by Proteſtants, and but now refuted, as to the obedience, and the degree of it called for in-covenant.] You anſwer, *If you interpret the Papiſts as meaning that the Law requires true perfection, but accepts of ſincere, then if it be ſpoken of the Law of works, or nature, it is falſe, and not the ſame with theirs whom you oppoſe. Anſw.* I marvail that you will put the caſe [if I do] when *I* tell you expreſly that *I* do not. *I* limit the parallel to the obedience, and degree called for in Covenant, which theſe Reverend Divines make to be the ſame, as thoſe that *I* had ſpoken to, but differ reſpective to acceptation: and ſo their miſtake, if it be one, is infinitely below the Popiſh error in the Councill of Trent held forth, which *I* did oppoſe. You further ſay, *If you take them, as no doubt you do, as meaning it of the Law of Chriſt, as the Trent Council expreſs themſelves; then no doubt but they take the Law of Chriſt, in the ſame extended ſenſe, as was before expreſſed: and then they differ from us but in the fore-mentioned notion. Anſw.* I do not underſtand your diſtinction between the Law of nature, and the

Law

Law of Chriſt, as *I* have before largely told you, and given in my reaſons. You ſpeak ſomewhat in that which follows, that *the Papiſts do not indeed take the Covenant or Law it ſelf to command true perfection, but that which they call perfection, which is no other then the grace of Sanctification, as I expreſſed out of ſome of the chief of the writers: But it is true perfection that thoſe mean whom I now write againſt.* And ſo you conclude, that you ſee not the leaſt ground for my firſt charge. But you might obſerve what I further ſay in words more at large, then is here fit to be repeated, purpoſely to prevent this objection, that they look upon this, which we ſay is no more then *Sanctification*, as full *Perfection*; and ſuch that anſwers to the Law in the ſenſe in which it was given. Our *character of grace inherent* is their *interpretation of the Law:* and ſo they raiſe up men in a conceit that they anſwer the Law, when they live in a continual breach of it.

2. I ſaid, [If this opinion ſtand, then God accepts of Covenant-breakers, of thoſe that deal falſly in it, whereas Scripture chargeth it upon the wicked, upon thoſe of whom God complains, as rebellious, *Deut.* 29. 25. *Joſ.* 7. 15. *Jer.* 11. 10. and 22. 8, 9.] &c. You anſwer, *This charge proceedeth meerely from the confounding of the duty as ſuch, and the condition as ſuch*; And you proceed *ex non conceſſis*, to charge me with this confuſion; taking it for granted in the words that follow, *that a Covenant, which is alſo a Law, as well as a Covenant, may by the preceptive part, conſtitute much more duty then ſhall be made the condition of the promiſes.* In which I conceive there is a double miſtake. 1. That a Covenant properly ſo called (of which we ſpeak) can be a Law in the proper acceptation. For a covenant is of 2. parties, either of both concurring to the conſtitutiõ of it, & if it be a Law, both parties are as well Law-givers, as Covenant-makers. A Superiour may impoſe a condition as by a Law, but that is but one part of a Covenant. 2. That there is any *duty* in a Covenant, that is not alſo of the *Condition* of it. I am ſure in the Covenant of Grace there is nothing *duty*, which is not a *condition*. Faith and Repentance are *conditions*, and if you can tell me of any thing elſe which is matter of *duty*, taking Repentance in its due latitude, *viz.* to ceaſe to do evill, and learne to do well, it will be a piece of a new Catechiſme with me; Theſe you grant are *conditions*, and this the [all] of a Chriſtians *duty*.

duty. Whereas you ſay, If you will ſpeak ſo largely as to ſay, *All who break the preceptive part of the Covenant, are Covenant-breakers, then no doubt God accepteth of many ſuch, and none but ſuch* —— *for Whether we ſay,* (ſay you) *that the New Law commandeth perfect obedience, ornot, yet except you take it exceeding reſtrainedly, it muſt be acknowledged, that the precept is of larger extent then the condition, having appointed ſome duties which it hath not made* ſine qua non *to ſalvation. Anſw.* I think God accepts of none that break the preceptive part of the Covenant, in the ſenſe, as the preceptive part of it *qua* Covenant, is to be underſtood; & as interpreters uſually give as the meaning of it. God accepts (that I know) none (to ſpeak *de adultis*) but thoſe that walk before him, and are ſincere. He neither accepts of profaneneſſe, nor men of hypocriticall diſſimulation. I know *ſincerity* hath its latitude, as *perfection* ſtrictly taken hath not: An upright heart in temptations hath many a great ſhock; but if you can ſay, that the duty of the Covenant is ſo laid aſide, that the heart is not right in the ſight of God, as *Peter* of *Simon Magus*, (which muſt be ſaid if the precept of ſincerity and uprightneſſe be broke) then I do not know that there is any acceptance. *Simon Magus* muſt be in another frame, before the thoughts of his heart be forgiven him. And this I am confident is the thoughts of my learned friend whom you mention, if I do not (as I think I do not) miſtake the man: And I have my reaſon for this confident opinion. And as I wonder at your diſtinction betwixt the *duty* and *condition* of a Covenant, ſo I no leſſe marvail at your Simile. You tell me, *If I ſend my Child a mile of an errand, and ſay, I charge you, play not by the way, but make haſt, and do not go in the dirt, &c. and if you come back by ſuch an houre, I will give you ſuch a reward; if not, you ſhall be whipt; He that plaies by the way & dirties himſelf; & yet comes back by the houre appointed, doth break the preceptive part, but not the condition.* Your diſtinction is between the preceptive part, and the condition in a Covenant, and here you talke of a precept that is no part of the Covenant; but if I put all within the Covenant, and ſay, Come again within an houre, not playing, or dirtying your ſelf; if he either out ſtay his houre, or play, or run in the dirt, he forfeites his reward, and is at mercy for a whipping, according to Covenant. You ſpeak afterward of a mans breach of ſome particular Covenant, which

a man may do in a temptation; and yet as to the Covenant of grace, be ſincere.

3. I ſaid, [Then it will follow, that as none can ſay, They have ſo anſwered the command of the Law that they have never failed; So neither can they with the Church make appeale to God that they have not dealt faſly in the Covenant, *Pſal.* 44 17. Every ſin (according to this opinion) being a breach of it, and a dealing faſly in it.] You reply, *This charge is as unjuſt as the former.* I confeſſe it, and you giving no further reaſon, I ſhall ſit down with the former anſwer.

4. I ſaid, [Then the great promiſe of mercy from everlaſting to everlaſting upon them that fear him, and his righteouſneſſe unto Childrens Children to ſuch as keep his Covenant, and to thoſe that remember his Commands to do them, *Pſal.* 103. 17, 18. only appertaines to thoſe that keep the Law, that they ſin not at all againſt it.] You anſwer, *It follows not: If they ſincerely keep the Law, they fulfill the conditions of the Covenant, though not the precept.* And I ſay, the precept of the Covenant goes no higher then ſincerity: And I had thought you had fully concurred with me. *That Chriſt* (ſay you) *as the Mediator of the new Covenant ſhould command us not only ſincere but perfect obedience to the moral law; & ſo hath made it a proper part of his Goſpel, not only as a directory and inſtruction, but alſo as a command, I am not yet convinced: Adding, My reaſon is, becauſe I know not to what end Chriſt ſhould command us that obedience which he never doth enable any man in this life to performe.* Aphor. 157, 158. How theſe can be reconciled, I know not. I think none is inabled through grace to be more then ſincere: and then the precept of the Covenant according to you requires no more. You further ſay, *They keep the precept in an improper, but uſuall ſenſe, as keeping is taken for ſuch a leſſe degree of breaking as on Goſpel grounds is accepted. Anſw.* They keep it, if they be ſincere, in the ſenſe as Chriſt the Mediator of the Covenant gave it, & in as proper a ſenſe as they keep the conditions.

5. I ſaid, [Then our Baptiſm-vow is never to ſin againſt God, and as often as we renew our Covenant, we do not only humble our ſelves that we have ſinned, but we afreſh bind our ſelves never more to commit the leaſt infirmity.] To this you anſwer, *We do not promiſe in Baptiſm to do all that the precept of the Covenant requireth, but all that is made the condition of*

life

life, and to endeavour the reſt. I deſire to know where you find this diſtinction as applied to our Baptiſm-vow. You ſay pag. 79. of this Apology, that *Baptized ones are to renouuce the Fleſh, the World, and the Devill, and that this abrenunciation hath been in the Church ever ſince the Apoſtles daies*, quoting *Tertullian, Cyprian*, and all antiquity for it. I would know whether *Tertullian, Cyprian*, or any other eminent in ancient times, help'd it out with your diſtinction, that we engage to renounce them, not as duty, but as a condition to obtaine Salvation. This privative part of duty holding out the *terminus à quo*, in our Chriſtian motion, implyes a poſitive work, which alſo was expreſſed in our Engliſh Leiturgie, *conſtantly to believe Gods holy word, and obediently keep his commands*; and confirmed by the Apoſtle to be our duty, Ro. 6. 4. *Buried with him by Baptiſm into death, that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſſe of life.* This we vow, and I deſire to know what more in any Goſpel-precept is required?

6. I ſaid, [then the diſtinction between thoſe that enter Covenant, and break it, as *Jer.* 31. 32, 33. and thoſe that have the Law written in their hearts, and put into their inward parts to obſerve it, falls: all ſtanding equally guilty of the breach of it; no help of grace being of power to enable to keep Covenant.] To this you anſwer: *When ſincere obedience, and perfect obedience, are all one, and when the precept, and the condition of the Covenant are proved to be of equall extent, then there will be ground for the charging of this conſequence.* I marvail how the firſt part of the anſwer came into your thoughts. That Text of *Jeremiah* ſpeaks to ſincerity, and not to perfection. For the ſecond, ſincerity is the precept, and ſincerity is the condition: ſincerity is one and the ſame, and therefore precept and condition are one and the ſame. That which we are to renounce, and that to which we engage, is our condition. But that which we renounce, and that to which we engage is the Goſpel, or Covenant-precept: The precept and condition are therefore the ſame. Faith and new obedience are the precept, Faith and new obedience are the condition; The precept and condition are therefore one and the ſame. So that your diſtinction falling, as I doubt not but it do's, all my arguments after the firſt to the laſt, *eo nomine* ſtand. You go about to evade them all

The precept, and the condition, in the Covenant of Grace, are one.

with this one distinction, which I leave to the judicious Reader to determine, whether it be not without a difference.

But before I undertake your next, I have to thank you for that which you have transcribed out of *Robert Baronius*, pag. 401. of your Confession. Treating in an Appendix *of the possibility of fulfilling the Law of God, considered according to Gospel lenity*, you tell us what his second assertion is, *pag.* 122. which I desire the Reader to peruse, either in your book, or in the Author himself: Where he may see, 1. *That the Gospel is below the Law, as to the degree that it requireth.* As to the one there is a possibility of fulfilling, (according to him) and not so to the other. 2. *That the obligation of the Law yet remains, so that all failings are transgressions.* 3. *That it stands as a Rule for us to affect, and with our best strength to endeavour after.* 4. *That the Gospel requires a certain measure of obedience, on pain of eternal damnation.* This doubtless is that which is the condition of it. 5. *That this obedience thus required, is necessarily to be, as high as grace enables to reach.* In which we see in the first place, their distinction opposed, that say, That the Gospel requires perfection, and accepts sincerity. The Gospel according to him requires no more then it accepts, and for which grace enables. And in the next place, your distinction of *duty* and *condition*, is by him utterly overthrown, according to him, all comes within the condition, which is matter of duty.

My last argument was, [Then it follows, that sincerity is never called for as a duty, or required as a grace, but only dispens'd with, as a failing, and indulged, as a want. It is not so much a Christian's honour, or Character, as his blemish; rather his defect, then praise. But we find the contrary in *Noah, Job*, &c.] To this you reply, *I will not say, it is past the wit of man to find the ground of this charge*, i. e. *to see how this should follow; but I dare say, it is past my wit. If it had been said, The Covenant commandeth perfection, and not sincerity, or the Covenant accepteth sincerity, but not commandeth it, there would have been some reason for this charge. But do you think that sincerity is no part of perfection, &c? Answ.* My wit is so low, that I know not where the cloud lies. I do not take sincerity to be properly a part of perfection, but a degree towards it; as *Calor ad unum*, is a degree towards, rather then a part of *Calor ad octo*, So the lower degree of heat would remain, when a higher is introduc'd

duc'd, and not be ſwallowed up in it. And if the command looks no lower then perfection in degree, the imperfect degree is not directly commanded, though (according to theſe) it is indulged. It is ſaid *Matth.* 12. 20. that Chriſt *will not break the bruiſed Reed, nor quench the ſmoaking Flax.* Is that feeble ſtrength, and remiſs heat, there look'd upon as a duty; or rather is it not look'd upon as a defect, or want? Is it not Chriſt's indulgence, rather then the obedience of his command, that is there noted or pointed out?

My anſwer to the ſingle argument, (ſo far as I have read, or heard, againſt that which I here delivered) follows. But, ſeeing that your reply, ſo far as I can judge, is rather with me, then againſt me, as to the Poſition it ſelf; and your endeavour, rather to excuſe, then defend thoſe of the contrary opinion, (which very well pleaſeth me, for I wiſh that more were ſaid for their honour, ſo that the truth do not ſuffer) I am well content to paſs it by, having a greater deſire to defend you, where you ſpeak for truth, then my ſelf, where not truth, but my reputation is impugned: And ſhall make it my buſineſs to look into that, which Mr. *Crandon* hath againſt you in it. Concerning the ſecond, that the Goſpel doth require but ſincere, not perfect obedience, which is both your aſſertion and mine, he ſaith, *What ſhall we think of thoſe Texts in the new Teſtament, which require us to be perfect? 2 Cor.* 13. 11 *Jam.* 1. 4. *Yea perfect as God is perfect, Matt.* 5. 48. *reproving weakneſs and infirmity, and commanding a going on to perfection. Anſw.* We are to think of them as Proteſtant Divines ordinarily do in their commenting upon them; *We deny,* ſaith *Rivet, that the perfection of which Scripture ſpeaks, either when it commands us to be perfect, or gives teſtimony of perfection, or integrity to ſome, conſiſts in a freedome from ſin,* Exercit. 52. in *Geneſ.* pag. 267. The Text quoted out of *James,* ſerves well to explain the reſt, *Let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing,* whence we may argue, 1. That perfection which Chriſtians may attain, is the perfection that the Apoſtle calls unto, This is plain in the Text, he calls for perfection, that we may perfect: But Chriſtians can reach no further a degree in perfection then ſincerity; Therefore the Apoſtle calls onely to ſincerity. 2. That is the Apoſtles meaning, where he ſpeaks of perfection, that himſelf gives in as his meaning; This is cleer, he

Mr. *Crandons* arguments anſwered.

is the beſt interpreter of himſelf. But he expreſſes himſelf by *perfect* there to mean *entire*, or *lacking nothing*. A perfection of entireneſs, or integrality then he means, a perfection of parts, and not of degrees. For that Text of *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 13. 11. *Finally brethren, farewell, be perfect*, &c. let us compare with it, that which he teſtifies of ſome in *Corinth.* 1 Cor. 2. 6. *Howbeit we ſpeak wiſdome among them that are perfect*, that is, thoſe that have a right and more full underſtanding of Goſpel myſteries, put in oppoſition to the weakneſs of novices, which perfection is, (according to the Apoſtle) the way to unity of judgment. As for the Text, *Matth.* 5. 48. *Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father which is in heaven is perfect*, If it be ſtreined to the higheſt, it calls for a divine, increated perfection, Mr. *Crandon* then muſt yield, that there is a *ſicut ſimilitudinis, non æqualitatis*, in that place. And if the context be conſulted, we ſhall find, that it is oppoſed to that half-hypocriticall-righteouſneſs, which was found in Scribes and Phariſees; which all muſt exceed that enter into the Kingdome of heaven. In *Heb.* 6. 1. a novice-like imperfection in knowledge, is reproved; and a further growth towards perfection is called for.

Mr. *Crandon* goes on, *If perfection were not the duty of a Chriſtian, and unperfectneſs, and infirmity his ſin, why doth the Apoſtle groan, and grieve under the remainder of his natural infirmities, and preſs on to perfection*, Rom. 7. 14. to the 24. *Phil.* 3. 12, 14? The concluſion here is granted; the one is a duty, the other is a ſin, and becauſe of failing in the one, and the burden of the other, the Apoſtle groans. Foreſeeing that this would be yeelded him, he addes by way of objection, *Or is ſuch unperfectneſs a ſin onely in reference to the rule of the Law, and not the Rule of the Goſpel, or that the Law doth, but the Goſpel doth not call for perfection? Anſw.* There is not one rule of the Law, as I have demonſtrated at large, and another of the Goſpel, ſeeing the Goſpel eſtabliſhes the Law; onely the Goſpel-Covenant calls for thoſe ſincere deſires, which grace works to conform in its meaſure to the Rule of the Law. He addes. *This is both contrary to the Scriptures alleaged, and doth withall make the Goſpel to allow imperfections.* But both of theſe have been already anſwer'd. What he further addes, anſwers it ſelf, ſave onely his great pains to pump out your meaning. But I ſhall leave you to be your own interpreter, and forbear in this to interpoſe between you.

Thus

Thus I have paſſed through (Grace aſſiſting) thoſe things, wherein our judgements differ, as alſo thoſe in which we agree in one. Some other things there are, which both of us problematically enquire into; which Sect. 56, 57, 58 You treat of, under this title [*Of the life promiſed, and death threatned to* Adam, *in the firſt Law.*] In which neither you, nor I, (as I think) ſee any important difference; and in them I muſt confeſs, that you deal with much candour; though there be ſome things in them, to which I might ſpeak my differing thoughts, yet I ſhall forbear further to be the Readers trouble, and leave all to enjoy their own judgement.

SECT. IX.

The concluſion of the whole, with an enquiry into the judgement of Antiquity about ſeverall things in reference to juſtification.

AS you have ſaluted me in a Prologue, ſo you are pleaſed in your cloſe, in a particularaddreſſe, to take your leave, In which, among other things, you wiſh me not *to ſuppoſe, that you judge of all the reſt of my booke, as you do of this that you have replyed to.* Telling me, that you *value the Wheat, while you help to weed out the tares.* I am glad that I have your approbation in any thing, and I hope you will not be offended that I mind you, that in this work of weeding out *Tares*, you ſtand in danger to weed out the *Wheate* alſo. It is ſaid by ſome, that the tares in thoſe parts, carried ſo near reſemblance with the *Wheat*, that they could hardly be diſtinguiſhed. I am ſure, that if I had judged the leaſt nature of a *Tare* to have been in any of that which you have gon about to weed out, it never had been ſown there; and I did believe, that I was rather *weeding*, then *ſowing Tares*, when I was upon the work you examine. I dare not brand all that ſeed with the name of *Tares*, which is not pure *Wheat*. In a Corn field, there are ſeeds of a middle nature, Not *pure Corn*, nor yet ſuch, that like *Tares* are dangerouſly prejudiciall to overtop, and deſtroy the Corn; whether they be *Tares*, or *Wheat*, or other ſeed of a middle nraure, we muſt both leave to the judgement of the Maſter of the

har-

harveſt. You ſpeak of a *Pardon* in the next place for your *confident concluding me in an error, and your ſelf in the truth*; In which I have all reaſon (if that muſt paſſe as a fault, needing *Pardon*) to be facile; ſeeing I need it from you, as well, as you from me; Though I am not in expectation of like credence as you (your name with ſome, being enough to put in ballance againſt all the Arguments that another hand can produce) yet I believe, that I am as far above ſcruples. As I have not heard, that your elaborate replies, to thoſe learned friends, that in private have given in their animadverſions, have given them ſuch ſatisfaction, as to change their judgements; ſo I confeſſe it fares with me; And when either of us ſtand this way opinionated, no other courſe can be taken, then that which you mention, either to leave the other, and both of us, all others, to judge by the evidence of arguments on both ſides, with what part the truth reſts. I have made it my buſineſſe in moſt poynts of difference, to enlarge my ſelf further with arguments then before I judged to be needfull. I doubt not but they will undergo different cenſures. I ſhall not much matter what on the ſuddaine will be voyced, but ſhall rather weigh (if God prolong life) what after a few years will be more generally thought. Neither ſhall I in the meane time aſſume the boldneſſe to charge you with any error, you have herein foreſtalled me, in the preface of your Confeſſion, in your enumeration of thoſe qualifications, which you expect in any that ſhall attempt it. 1. *That he be a man of a ſtronger judgement, and of a more diſcerning head; and not one of thoſe that* Nazianz. *deſcribes*, Orat. 1. *and* (*after* Pag. 453.) *think themſelves wiſe enough to be teachers, or contradict others, when they have got two or three words of Scripture: Nor ſuch as have not wit for an ordinary buſineſſe, and yet think thy can maſter the deepeſt controverſies. He that thinks to do this without a peircing wit* (*as well as grace*) *ordinarily thinks to ſee without eyes.* 2. *That he be one that hath longer, and more diligently and ſeriouſly exerciſed himſelf in theſe ſtudies, then I have done.* 3. *That he be one more free from prejudice and partiality then I am.* 4. *That he have more of the illumination of Gods Spirit, which is the chief.* 5. *That he have a more ſanctified heart, that he may not be led away by wrong ends, or blinded by his vices.* It is not for me here to enter compariſon; There being but one piece, of one of them, in which I can

ſpeak

ſpeak any ſuch priority, I have been longer (*I* think) exerciſed in theſe ſtudies, which is all that I have to plead, and I wiſh it had been with more ſerious diligence; It is my way then to keep ſilence; Though many may think that you are ſcarce ſerious, in judging all of theſe to be neceſſary requiſites, in any that ſhall take upon them ſuch boldneſs; ſeeing you ſeem not to tye your ſelf up to this Rule, in your dealings with others. You are pleaſed ſometimes to ſay, that you *ſhould have little modeſty, or humility, if you ſhould not think more highly of the underſtanding of many Reverend and Learned Brethren, who diſſent from you* (in ſeverall points debated between you and me) *then of your own*: Yet who is it, of all theſe, that you do not charge with error? Yea where is there the man, almoſt in the world, that hears not that charge from your pen? More then once you charge error, on Reverend Dr. *Twiſſe*, Prolocutor (while he lived) of the late Aſſembly; in ſpeaking for juſtification of of Infidels (as you call it,) and making it an immanent act in God, warning younger Students to be wary in their Reading of him. In whoſe behalf Mr. *Jeſſop* hath ſtood up as an advocate, not pleading juſtification in his name, but not guilty; In which I ſhall not interpoſe. My judgement in the thing is ſufficiently known. You charge the *Aſſembly* that ſet him up in that honour, in like ſort; entring your diſſent from their *larger Catechiſm* in four paſſages, from their *confeſſion* in ſix, deſiring onely indeed, a liberty of expounding, but in ſeveral of them you well know that your expoſition was none of their meaning, which you do not obſcurely ſignifie, in the different expreſſion of your ſelf, in your diſſent from them, and from the Synod of *Dort*. You charge the *pious Miniſtry* of this Nation in general (out of whom that Aſſembly was gathered) in the Preface of your Confeſſion, with error in their thoughts about Church Diſcipline, and if information do not deceive me, as full an Aſſembly of Learned, and pious Miniſters, as Conveniently live for ſuch a meeting together, in any part of the Nation, after a full debate of that which you charge as an error, determined it againſt you. Laſtly, you charge the *whole reforming party of Divines*, with four great errors, as we have ſeen in your Apology, *pag.* 16. Now for a man to think, that you judge your ſelf above all theſe, in this gradation mentioned, in every one of thoſe enumerated qualifications, were in-

deed to challenge, both your humility and modesty. Your Readers then must conclude, that either you were not serious in your List given in; or else you take liberty to transgress your own Rules, and set upon that work your self, which you will not allow in others. After quotation of severall passages of the Fathers (with which all must vote) you seem to prefer one of *Austin* above all, *contra rationem nemo sobrius, contra Scripturas nemo Christianus, contra ecclesiam nemo pacificus*; Making that application of this, as you have done of none of the other, That *in the point of faiths instrumentality*, and *the nature of the justifying act*, taking in afterwards *the interest of mans obedience in justification, as it is consummate in judgement, you are constrained upon all these three gronnds to give in your dissent.* I can perswade none to abjure Christianity, renounce reason, and make a schism in the Church (as it seems you think you must do) to come over to me; and yeelding (as cleerly enough you do) that I have this little corner of the world, wheresoever Protestants dwell, for an hundred and fifty yeers past on my side, sure you stand amazed, that none of all these men, in so long a space of time, can either be brought to the light of reason, or to a right understanding of Scriptures, or yet to returne to that unity, from which they have in so foul a Schism departed. These points, on the two first grounds, have been brought already (as well as I can do it) to the test; In which you see, my reason against yours; and my sense of Scriptures, against that which you have given; The third onely doth remain to be enquired into, and I cannot yet believe that the Church is my adversary. And here you seem to put me fairly to it. *If you will bring* (say you) *one sound reason, one word of Scripture, or one approved writer of the Church, (yea or one Heretick, or any man whatsoever) for many hundred years after Christ (I think I may say* 1300. *at least) to prove that Christ, as Lord, or King, is not the object of the justifying act of faith, or that faith justifieth properly as instrument*, I am contented so far to lose the reputation of my reason, understanding, reading, and memory. You speak this, you say, because *I tell you, there was scarce a dissenting voyce among our Divines against me about the instrumentality of faith*, and if (say you) *there cannot be brought one man that consenteth with them for* 1200. *or* 1400. *years after Christ, I pray you tell me, whom an humble and modest peaceable man should follow? Answ.* For reason,

ſon, or Scripture, I ſhall bring no more then I have done, I think you may ſee both, in that which I have already written. The Churches teſtimony onely now remains to be looked after, whether you, or I can lay the fairer claime; and here you diſtinguiſh of it. 1. As it was for the firſt 1200, 1300, 1400 yeers after Chriſt, for you name all of theſe Periods. 2. As it hath been for 150. yeers now paſt. The Church for one full hundred yeers at leaſt, it ſeems by you, ſtood Newter, *viz.* from 1400. to 1500. The Church for this little ſcantling of time, *viz.* for 150. yeers is not denyed by you to vote with me, if the Proteſtant party to which you joyn in communion, may deſerve that name. But for all that ſpace as before, it was (as you pretend) unanimouſly yours; at well the Orthodox, as the Hereticall party in it. Here, for further diſcovering of truth, two things ſhould be enquired into. 1. Whether he, more worthily deſerves the name of an enemy of the Churches peace, that diſſents in judgement from the Church in ſome particulars, as in ages paſt it was; or he that confeſſedly diſſents from the Church whereof he is, and where he lives, and as that preſent, it ſtands? I think, here the determination is eaſie; Let us enquire whether of theſe diſſents will work more heart-broyles, quarrels, contentions, envyings, mutuall oppoſitions, and needleſs diſputes, and let that be agreed upon (as well it may) to bear the blame. If all muſt be tyed up to keep peace, and be at one with the Church, as to all particular tenents, in the revolution of all theſe ages, they are then tyed to know, and their Paſtors are bound to teach, what in all ſucceſſive ages hath been the Churches opinion. But this were a great burden for Paſtors, and far more intolerable to be put upon the people. If a man may be ſecure in this, that he goeth not againſt truth, I think he need not trouble himſelf as to ages paſt, in the matter of peace. Had you produced the vote of Antiquity, as a probable inducement to perſwade, that you had truth according to Scripture, and reaſon, on your part, it had been ſomewhat, ſuch appeals to humane Authority, after Divine Teſtimony produced, is ordinary; but to diſſent from the Church, in which a man lives, and of which he is, to avoid the danger of a breach of peace, with the Church that ſometimes was, is ſuch a way of peace, that I never yet knew trodden, or taken. 2. Whether Antiquity be as cleer for you, as

the Church in preſent is for me? The latter you freely grant, but the former will, I think, hardly be yeelded, notwithſtanding what you ſay, *Becauſe a word, or an opinion, that is unſound, hath got poſſeſſion of a little corner of the world for about* 150 *yeers; therefore I am ſuſpected as a noveliſt, for forſaking it. Whereas it is to avoid ſingularity, and notorious novelty, that I aſſent not to your way. The ſame I ſay about the intereſt of mans obedience, in his juſtification, as continued, and conſummate in judgement. If either* Clemens Roman. Polycarp. Ignatius, Juſtin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Clem. Alexand. Minutius Fælix, Arnobius, Lactantius, Cyprian, Athanaſius, Euſebius, Greg. Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Cyrill Hieroſol. Syneſius, Cyrill Alexandr. Macarius, Hierome, Salvian, Vincentius Lirin. Vigilius, *or any councill were of your mind in any one of theſe points, and againſt mine, then I will confeſs, at leaſt my ſupine negligence in Reading, and my very faulty Memory, in retaining their words.* How fully you have proved the unſoundneſs, either of the word, or opinion in queſtion, others muſt judge, But whether the novelty be ſo notorious, as you ſpeak, is to be enquired into, and in order to that, I ſhall requeſt you,

Some things propounded to the Readers conſideration

1. To take into conſideration who they be that make the loudeſt noyſe, and ſend out the greateſt Cracks about the Fathers; If the Church of *Rome* may be believed, all Antiquity is theirs. Hoping to put that cheat upon us, as the *Gibeonites* ſometimes did upon *Iſrael*, It is ſtill their pretence that all former ages were on their ſide. *If we might but appeale to the Fathers* (ſaith *Campian*) *the controverſie were ended, They are all as fully ours,* (ſaith he) *as Pope* Gregory *the* 13. *that moſt Loving father of the Sons of the Church.* As the *windowes* in the Church & all other *things and thinglings* (to take the liberty to coyne Engliſh as he doth Latine) are their witneſſes, So all the *Fathers* alſo, that the truth is with them. I will ſay no more, but that theſe naked names will appear to Judicious Readers, but as an empty ſound; a voice and nothing more.

Ad patres ſi quando licebit accedere, confectum eſt prælium; Tam ſunt omnes noſtri quam Gregorius 13. *Papa, filiorum eccleſiæ amantiſſimus Pater. Teſtes feneſtræ & omnes res & reculæ.*

2. That ſome of untainted integrity, and of no leſſe ability to give account of the Judgement of Antiquity, in theſe controverſies, have aſſerted the full contrary to that, which you here with ſo much confidence deliver. *Chemnitius* was a man differing from you, in every piece of this doctrine, in which you

you diffent from me, and particularly your adverſary in all theſe three poynts in which you make this appeal to former ages. He is a man zealous for the inſtrumentality of Faith in Juſtification, he is large in aſſerting the promiſe of mercy in Chriſt, to be the ſpeciall object of Juſtifying Faith; and againſt your diſtinction of Juſtification, begun by Faith alone, and conſummate by works; yea, there is not a man that ever wrote, that appears more your adverſary in this poynt then he, being judged the moſt learned, grave, and moderate of that party in the Reformed Churches, wherewith you are moſt diſpleaſed, in this Controverſie, yet he is full in quotation of Antiquity as of his ſide, both in his Common places and in his Examination of the Council of *Trent*, 144. After a Liſt of authorities brought by him, his cloſe is worth obſervation, (a) *Theſe few* (ſaith he) *I have noted, that it may appear that our doctrine of Juſtification, is atteſted by all the Godly of all ages, that have lived in all times, and that not in their Rhetoricall declamations, or vaine diſputes, but in their ſerious exerciſes of Repentance and Faith, in their Conflicts of conſcience in temptation, or with their own unworthineſſe, or before the Tribunal of God, or in the Agony of death: For this way* (ſaith he) *the doctrine of Juſtification as it is delivered in Scripture, can alone rightly be underſtood.* What can be now more contrary then his Teſtimony and yours? how high are both your confidences in full contradiction one againſt another? That which you ſay is a notorious novelty, he ſaith, hath the atteſtation of all antiquity; who ſhall he now believe, that hath not, nor cannot ſearch the Authors themſelves, that have lived in your 1300. or 1400. years?

3. I would have you to take into ſerious conſideration theſe following Quæres.

1. Whether the doctrine of thoſe that bore the name, and outward face of the Church, was uniforme, through out that whole ſeries of time that you take in, in you challenge? Whether in the time of *Thomas Aquinas*, and the following ages, the doctrine concerning Juſtification, in the Latine Church, was the ſame as in the daies of *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, and *Auſtine*? If ſo, then the doctrine of merit, in the higheſt way, as it is now taught in the Church of *Rome*, was delivered by the Fathers; & the oppoſition [illegible], is, as notorious a novelty, as this of the inſtrumentality of Faith, or juſtifying act, by you is preten-

(a) *Hæc pauca ideo annotavi, ut oſtenderem doctrinam noſtram de Juſtificatione, habere teſtimonia omnium piorum qui omnibus temporibus fuerunt: idque non in declamatoriis rhetoricationibus, nec in otioſis diſputationibus, ſed in ſeriis exercitiis pœnitentiæ & fidei, quando conſcientiæ in tentationibus cum ſuâ indignitate, vel coram ipſo judicio Dei, vel in agone mortis luctatur. Hoc enim ſolo modo, rectiſſimè intelligi poteſt doctrina de juſtificatione ſicut in Scripturâ traditur.* Quæres put concerning this Appeale.

ded. How high *Aquinas* is for merit, as alſo his followers, all that caſt their eyes upon him may ſoon ſee: And in caſe in this time, a change intervened, and a new way be introduced, you were not ſo adviſed to jumble together ſo many ages of ſo different a complexion, even *Lombard* himſelf was not the ſame man, as Schoolmen that in ſome ages followed him.

2. Whether there be any important change in the doctrine of Juſtification in the Church of *Rome*, ſince that time that cloſeth up your account, *viz. ann.* 1400. to this day? As I take it, their doctrine is ſubſtantially the ſame now, as it was in *Aquinas* his age, and ſome time before him. The *Council of Trent* laid down the ſame doctrine in this thing, that their Doctors had of ſeverall ages held. And though they put upon it their ſanction, yet they made no ſenſible variation, as they expreſly declare themſelves, *Seſſ.* 6. *Cap.* 8. And the preſent Church of *Rome*, rigidly adheres to it. It being therefore the ſame for 1400. years time, as the moſt Antient Fathers taught, yea as Chriſt and his Apoſtles delivered (as afterwards you take the boldneſſe to aſſert) and the ſame now as it was then, The doctrine of *Rome* in the doctrine of Juſtification is now the ſame, as Chriſt and his Apoſtles left it, Being faithfully kept by Fathers, Schoolemen, determined by the Council of *Trent*, & now maintained by *Jeſuites* & their adhærents. This is too clearly by you implied; If it be indeed your thoughts that there is none or very little difference betwixt us and them in this poynt, ſee how much you diſſent from your learned friend, Mr. *Gataker*, where he tells you in his ſecond letter, of *that great difference that is between us, and the* Papiſts *in the Doctrine of Juſtification*: As I heare you bring in the name of reverend Mr. *Ball* to give honour to this, that the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and the Reformed Churches is one and the ſame, or inconſiderably differing, in this of Juſtification; which you ſpeak (as you ſay) being ſo informed, and I believe you have heard as much. For many years before his death, I heard it from an eminent hand, and acquainted Mr. *Ball* with it, who with much expreſſion of trouble of Spirit, that it ſhould be ſo voyced, diſclamed it, and afterwards in his Treatiſe of Faith (not then publiſhed) and his *poſthumus* work of the Co[illegible], hath given to the world ſufficient teſtimony againſt [illegible] his bruit perhaps, gave occaſion to that which Mr. *Cr*[illegible] inconſiderately vented,

vented, and you have ſo praiſe-worthily vindicated, and I judge it neceſſary that this of mine own knowledge (as being an ear witneſſe) ſhould be added.

3. Whether the Fathers that you mention, and others their contemporaries that you do not name, were ſo diſtinct, as might be deſired, in and about the word *Juſtification*, and other words of concernment touching this controverſie? Though as to the thing it ſelf they ſpeak according to the Scriptures; when they ſpeak of *Juſtification, Reconciliation, Remiſſion*, yet ſo farr as I have read, & find in the obſervation of others, they too uſually confound the words *Juſtification* and *Sanctification* together (which you declare your ſelf at leaſt to diſlike in others) making it not *verbum forenſe*, as you yeeld it is, but rather relating to our inhærent habituall Righteouſneſſe, whereby we are not pronounced, and acquitted as juſt, upon the merit of Chriſt, (which otherwiſe they orthodoxly own) but habitually ſo, and therefore ſo denominated; Being ſaid to be Juſtified, becauſe of unjuſt we are made juſt, which is the work of Sanctification, and implies a reall, and not a relative change, ſuch as is found in Juſtification; And if ſome termes of theirs need amendment, upon further inquiry into this doctrine, then why not others?

4. Whether it be the word *only* when you ſpeak of the *inſtrumentality* of Faith, or Faith in Chriſt *quà* Lord, not to be the juſtifying act, *or the thing it ſelf* that you intend, in that ſo large challenge of yours? If it be the want of the words only [*inſtrument*, or *quà Lord*] that you mention, your charge is very low, upon ſeverall accounts. 1. Words of art of this nature are ſeldome found in the Fathers. There are few diſcourſes in them about *cauſes*, whether *Efficient*, *Finall*, *Materiall*, *Formall*, *Inſtrumentall*, neither are there any, ſo exact logicall diſtinctions, under what notion they take that, which they are upon in their writings; Words of this kind were brought in by Schoolemen, and little uſe made of them, as I think, before *Lombards* daies. *Proteſtant* writers finding them in the Church, are neceſſitated to make uſe of them, as well that their adverſaries may underſtand them, as with their own weapons to deal with them, And the Schoolemen having found another inſtrument in Juſtification, *viz. Baptiſm* (as appears by the determination of the Council of *Trent*, Seſs. 6. Cap. 7.) it is

no

no marvel that when the Fathers uſe not the word at all, that theſe do not ſo uſe it, as it ought according to Scriptures. 2. You would be (I doubt not) as much wanting in making proofe of the uſe of your own termes among the Fathers, as your adverſaries of theirs; we may find the word [*inſtrument*] and the reſtrictive particle [*quâ*] in your twenty ſix Fathers, aſcribed to Faith in Juſtification, as oft as you can find your *cauſa ſine quâ non*, or, as I think, your *conditio cum quâ*. We may likewiſe find that diſtinction of *fides quæ*, and *fides quâ*, which you make the *generall cheat*, as often as you can find your diſtinctions already examined, which *Pag.* 3. *Sect.* 1. you heap together; When you challenge the words of others, as novel; it lies upon you, to aſſert the antiquity of your own. If it be the thing it ſelf, that you challenge, as not found in any Authors in this Compaſſe of time, I believe you will not be found ſo happy in your defence of this provocation, as *B. Jewell* was in the defence of his, that hē publiſhed at *Pauls Croſs*. I do not doubt but many Authors in this time aſcribe that office to Faith, and the whole of it, that the *Proteſtant* Churches make the inſtrumentall work, and that they aſſigne the ſame ſpecificall object of Faith, in the work of Juſtification, as is by the Reformed Churches now aſſerted.

5. To acquaint us how many of the Fathers, by you mentioned, have purpoſely treated upon, & particulary ſpoken to, this doctrine of Juſtification, and in what part of their works this ſubject is by them thus handled, that they that do not know it may turn and read it; I have a conſiderable part of thoſe that you mention, though ſome of them, I confeſs, I have not ſeen, as *Polycarp*, *Tatianus*, *Macarius*, *Athenagoras*, *Vigilius*, as I have ſeverall others that you mention not; and I would fayne ſee what they have, either for or againſt the *Proteſtant* belief. Thoſe that have not treated at all on this ſubject (as in ſome of them that you name, I am told by Dr. *Prideaux* that Chriſt is ſcarce mentioned) or have ſpoken upon it, only be the [by] are as much as nothing, their names might as well have been ſpared as mentioned. Mr. *T.* hath done as much for his *Antipædobaptiſm*, in naming ſome of the Antients that never appeared for *Infant-Baptiſm*, when they have not at all ſpoken to it, and their contemporaries have aſſerted it.

6. Whether the preſent Church of this age, in which we liv-

live (taking in our Fathers that lived within this happy 150. years, ſince the *Romiſh* yoke hath been caſt off) be not as conſiderable, and as much to be heeded in this controverſie, as all of thoſe in your liſt mentioned, if you ſhould put in, yet more to encreaſe (ſo far as names could do it) both weight and number? They were ſubject to error, and humane frailty, as well as the Church that is, and of late was. They were not able to decide their own Controverſies, but laboured, as well as we, under contentions, and diviſions; they were ſeldome unanimous, but often at difference, not only with others, but themſelves; Nay have not our Writers the far greater advantage? 1. Being far above yours in number; go through *Proteſtant* Learned Writers within this Compaſſe of time, and we ſhall find your Liſt of names far exceeded. 2. They have fully debated the cauſe, and in publick Aſſemblies determined it, in Confeſſions openly profeſſed it, Conſidered of, and anſwered arguments againſt it, turning over every ſtone to find out the truth in it, ſo it cannot be ſaid of the Fathers in your Liſt mentioned, and *Nil tam certum, quam quod ex dubio certum.* The Fathers that wrote before *Pelagius* have not been thought of that account, nor ſo meet Judges, in the point of Grace and Freewill, (having no adverſary, and therefore ſpake more looſly) as *Auſtin, Proſper, Fulgentius*, and thoſe that followed, who were by the adverſary put upon the ſtudy of it; *The greateſt Doctors at ſome times,* (ſaith *Dr.* Fr. White *Treat: of the Sabb.* p. 89.) *before Errors and Hereſies are openly defended, are not, neither can be ſo circumſpect in their writing, as to avoid all forms and expreſſions, all ſentences and propoſitions, all and every tenet, which in after times, may yield advantage to the adverſaries of truth.* Quoting Auſtin de Præd. Sanct. *cap.* 14. *To what purpoſe ſhould we ſearch into their works, which before this hereſie aroſe, had not need to buſie themſelves in the anſwer of this difficult queſtion? which doubtleſs they had done, if they had been put to deal with ſuch adverſaries?* This we may fitly apply to this point of juſtification, we are beholding the oppoſites of it, for a more induſtrious ſifting of it, and more cleer light in it. *Paul* had never ſpoke ſo much to aſſert a reſurrection, had there been none in that age that had denyed it. Had not Popiſh School-men perverted the doctrine of juſtification, Proteſtant Divines had never appeared with that zeal, and fervor of Spirit in it. And

Quid opus eſt ut eorum ſcrutemur opuſcula, qui priusquam iſta hæreſis oriretur, non habuerunt neceſſitatem in hâc aſſicili ad ſolvendum quæſtione verſari, quod præcul dubio facerent, ſi reſpondere talibus cogerentur?

the Fathers doubtleſs had been more exact in their Treatiſes of this point, had they ſeen it, (as we have done,) perverted and abuſed.

7. If Fathers, and all Antiquity were ſo abhorrent from the inſtrumentality of faith in juſtification, How is it probable that any ſingularly verſt in Antiquity, ſo, as to have few parallels, and no way affected to the Proteſtant doctrine in the point of juſtification, but averſe from it, and ſiding with the adverſary, ſhould own the inſtrumentality of faith, and argue for it? if Antiquity were ſo averſe from it, he that takes it up, is ſure either ignorant in Antiquity, or much engaged in his affections to the Proteſtant party: But ſuch there have been, that can neither be challenged as ignorant, nor ſuſpected for partiall engagement, that yet aſſert the inſtrumentality of faith, witneſs Bp. *Montague*. In whatſoever he hath otherwiſe been thought defective, and detected by Bp. *Carleton*, Dr. *Featley*, and others, yet he hath ever been of eminent name for an Antiquary. For his averſeneſs to the Proteſtant Doctrine of juſtification, let not onely his adverſaries ſpeak, that have appeared againſt him, but *Sanct. Clara* our adverſary, who *Problem.* 26. quotes *Montagues* Appeal, *Chap.* 6. to prove, the juſtification of a ſinner conſiſts in the inward work of grace inherent, agreeable, as he ſayes, with the holy definition of the Councill of *Trent*. Now that this great Antiquary, and friend of our adverſaries, appears for the inſtrumentality of faith in the work of juſtification, ſee his Appeal, *cap.* 9. *part.* 2. putting it into his title, that *God doth juſtifie originally, and faith inſtrumentally*, and reaſoneth for it in the Chapter it ſelf.

Proofs from antiquity for the inſtrumentality of faith.

Theſe things being premiſed, as to the firſt, concerning the *Inſtrumentality of Faith*, I thus argue. They that are for juſtification alone by faith, without limit, or diſtinction, as excluding all whatſoever elſe in man, they are for that which we call the inſtrumentality of faith in juſtification; But Antiquity is very large for juſtification alone by faith, without limit, or diſtinction, as excluding all in man, except faith, in this work; Therefore Antiquity is for that which we call the inſtrumentality of faith in juſtification. Here the Propoſition is firſt to be proved, and then the Aſſumption. The Propoſition I thus prove. To be juſtified by faith alone plainly holds forth ſomewhat peculiar to faith, which is not found in any other

grace

grace; this none can deny, and you confeſs, *pag.* 96, of your Confeſſion, *Concluſ.* 29. But nothing elſe can be faiths peculiar work, diſtinct from other graces, but to be an inſtrument in this work; This is cleer. This peculiar work, or office of faith muſt be, either to be an inſtrument in this work, or elſe a *Conditio cum quâ*, or, *cauſa ſine quâ non*, or elſe ſomewhat more noble then all of theſe, as the formal meritorious cauſe, &c. But its peculiar office cannot be meerly to be *Conditio cum quâ*, or, *cauſa ſine quâ non*, both theſe equally belong to the works of Sanctification; *Though they be all preſent together* (ſaith our Book of homilies) *yet they do not juſtifie together*, pag. 15. *At the ſame inſtant that God juſtifies*, ſaith *Davenant*, *he infuſes inhærent grace*, which yet he denies to be any *cauſe*, but an *Appendix* to our juſtification, *de Juſtit. habit.* cap. 23. pag. 315. *Bellarmine* ſayes, *That Proteſtants agree in this, that good work are not neceſſary to Salvation, but onely by a neceſſity of preſence*, lib. 4. de juſtit. *cap.* 7. That neceſſity by his confeſſion Proteſtants then acknowledge, and he intends juſtification, as is plain by the Subject he hath in hand. Here then is nothing peculiar to faith, to be meerly *conditio cum quâ*, or *cauſa ſine quâ non*, Neither can we aſcribe any more noble cauſality, as to be a formall, or meritorious cauſe, as needs not to be proved. The aſſerting of juſtification by faith therefore, denotes that which we make an inſtrument in juſtification. Now that the Antients aſſert, that we are juſtified *alone by faith*, putting in that excluſive particle, that Papiſts are wont to ſay, is not in Scriptures, nor Fathers, may be made good, 1. By manifold authorities aſſerting it. 2. By multitude of quotations. Our Book of Homilies, having quoted ſeverall Scripture-Texts for juſtification by faith alone, addes, *And after this-wiſe to be juſtified onely by this true and lively faith in Chriſt, ſpeaketh all the old, and Antient Authors, both Greek and Latine*, Ser. of Salvation, *par.* 2. *pag.* 16. And the Rhemiſts charging Proteſtants to foiſt the word [*onely*] into the Text, in *Rom.* 3. 28. *Fulk* replies. *You were beſt to charge all the Antient Fathers which uſe this term, of whom we have received it, to be Foyſters, and excluders of the Sacraments, and good works. The particle* [*alone by faith*] *in the article of juſtification, was not firſt deviſed by us*, ſaith *Chemnitius*, *but was alwayes uſed with great conſent in all Antiquity, as examples out of the writings of the Fathers do demonſtrate,*

which ſentences of the Fathers, ſaith he, *are gathered by* Robert Barnes, Æpinus, Bullinger, Otho Corberus, *&c. Loc. de juſtif.* pag. 772. Octavo. And *Chamier* Panſtrat. Cathol. *Tom.* 3. *lib.* 22. *c.* 5. having quoted Scripture, that faith alone juſtifieth, concludes, *ſo the Scripture is cleer with us; The Fathers in order are to be reckoned up by me, before I examine the exceptions of adverſaries.* The induction of quotations yet remaines, and I had it in my thoughts, to have ſet down the words themſelves (which for the moſt part are very expreſs) but I find that that would be tedious to my ſelf, and weariſome to the Reader, and divers of the Authors quoted to my hands I have not, I ſhall content my ſelf therefore to poynt out the Authors, quoting them, and the places quoted. *Ambroſe* in *Roman.* 1. *Rom.* 3. *Rom.* 4. *Rom.* 20. 1 *Cor.* 1. *Galat.* 1. *Galat.* 3. and *Sermon.* 45. (if it be *Ambroſes*) is quoted by *Chemnitius* in the place mentioned, who ſayes, that *Ambroſe repeats that excluſive particle* [*only*] *fifteen times.* By *Eckhardus* Compend. Theol. lib. 2. cap. 3. pag. 391. By *Chamier loco citato*, *Hilary* lib. 6 de Trinit. Can. 8. in *Matth.* 18. is quoted by *Chemnitius ibid. Fulk* in *Rom.* 3. 28. *Chamier*, *ibid. Davenant*, and *Prideaux* Lect. 5. *Hieron.* in *Rom.* 4. *Rom.* 10. in *Galat.* 2. *Galat.* 3. is quoted by *Chamier*, and *Eckhardus*, *ibid. Origen* lib. 3. in *Rom.* cap. 3. and lib. 4. is quoted by *Fulk*, *Eckhardus*, and *Chamier ibid. Chryſoſtome* in 1. *Cor.* 1 *Rom.* 3. *Hom.* 7. in *Tit.* 2. *Hom.* 3. *Rom.* 4. *Hom.* 8. *Galat.* 3. *Serm.* de fide & lege naturæ, *is quoted by Chamier*, *Eckhardus*, *Fulk*, *Davenant de Juſtit. habit.* cap. 29. pag. 378. and *Prideaux* Lect. 5. pag. 164. *Athanaſius* Orat. contra Arrianos is quoted by *Eckhardus ibid. Baſil Hom. de humil.* 51. is quoted by *Fulk*, *Eckhardus*, *Chamier*, *Davenant ibid. Nazianzen.* Orat. 22. 26. is quoted by *Fulk*, *Eckhardus*, *Chamier ibid. Theodoret* in *Rom.* 3. *Epheſ.* 2. is quoted by *Eckhardus*, as alſo *Therapeuticon Sept.* by *Chamier. Bernard* Serm. 22. in *Cant. Epiſt.* 27. is quoted by *Chamier*, *Eckhardut*, *Iſychius* in *Levit.* 14. *lib.* 4. is quoted by *Chamier*, and *Eckhardus. Theophilact* in *Galat.* 3. is quoted by *Chamier*, and *Chemnitius. Sedulius* in *Rom.* 3. *Rom.* 4. is quoted by *Chamier*, and *Chemnitius. Primaſius* in *Rom.* 4. *Rom.* 8. is quoted by *Chamier*, and *Eckhardus. Victor. Mar. lib.* 3. in *Genſ.* is quoted by *Eckhard. Fulk* in *Rom.* 4. *Petrus Chryſologus* Ser. 34. *Proſper. Aquitan.* Epigram. 9. are quoted by *Chamier. Ruffinus* is quoted by *Fulk*, *Beda* in *Pſal.* 77. pag. 71. by *Davenant*

nant, and Bp *Usher* de ſtatu & ſucceſſ. Eccleſ. *cap.* 2. *pag.* 46. *Gennadius* in *Rom.* 3. *Haymo* in *Rom.* 1. *Lyra* in *Galat.* 3. *Gloſs. Ordinaria* in *Epiſt. Jac.* is quoted by *Chemnitius*. *Theodulius* in *Rom.* 3. *Fortunatus* in *Expoſ. Symboli*, *Epiphanius* in *Ancor. Phylaſt.* in *Catal. Ireneus adverſus Hæreſ.* lib. 4. *Hæreſ.* 5. *Maxentius de fide*, are quoted by *Eckhardus*. And becauſe Papiſts ſay, that *Auſtin* uſes not this excluſive particle [*onely*] therefore *Chemnitius* tells us, that it is uſed by him, in *Serm. Quadrageſ.* as alſo in his expoſition of theſe words, *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteouſneſs*, which is in his 68. *Serm. de tempore lin.* 1. alſo *Tractat.* 8. *Tractat.* 42. in *Johan. Contra duas Epiſtol. Petil. lib.* 3 *Serm.* 40. *de verbis domini*, *Chamier* addes, *In octoginta tribus quæſtionibus Quæſt.* 76. Expoſit. in *Galat.* 3. *Chemnitius* having quoted theſe teſtimonies (that I have mentioned under his name) addes, *we may then truly ſay with* Eraſmus, *that this word* [*ſole*] *which is followed with ſo great clamours in this age in* Luther, *is reverently read, and heard, in the Fathers.* So that we ſee a peculiar intereſt, that faith hath in juſtification, which belongs to no other grace; And therefore it is no wonder, that you who forſake all the reformed Churches, that unanimouſly make it an inſtrument in juſtification, are at ſuch a ſtand as you are in *Concluſ.* 29. and 30. of your Confeſſion, what office in juſtification, to aſſign to it; you confeſs you cannot *hit upon the true and full difference in the point of Conditionality, in this work, between faith and obedience*; which is no marvail, ſeeing you oppoſe that which is indeed the difference, and Faiths peculiar office; which is, the inſtrumentall intereſting us in Chriſt; by way of acceptation, or apprehenſion, as *Iſychius* in the place quoted ſaith, *The grace* (viz. *of juſtification*) *is apprehended by faith, and not by works*, which is as plain a teſtimony as may be, for the inſtrumentality of this grace. *Chemnitius* yet further notes the way that Papiſts take to evade theſe teſtimonies. Objecting that the Antients uſed that particle [*ſole*] otherwiſe then we do, and returns his anſwer.

Sola fide apprehenditur, non ex operibus.

1. That they uſe the word ſole, or alone, to exclude all other ſects; intending no more, but that it is alone the Chriſtian Faith, and not the *Jewiſh*, or *Turkiſh*, that leads to Juſtification and Salvation. And this rule *Franc. à Sancta Clara* produces from *Vega*, Pag. 191. with no other approbation, but that it

it is ſometimes true, and *Chemnitius* quite overthrowes it, making it appear, that when the Fathers ſpeak of the application, apprehenſion, or acceptation of remiſſion of ſins by Faith, they ſtill oppoſe it to works, and not to other ſects, giving clear inſtances.

2. They object. That in the uſe of this particle [ſole] the Fathers exclude all works going before Faith, and Regeneration, and denying only, that the works of Infidels, and unregenerate, do juſtifie. This Rule *Franc. à Sancta Clara* doth produce out of *Caſalius*, but plainely enough ſignifies, that it will not ſatisfie. This *Chemnitius* alſo overthrowes, by ſeverall cleare teſtimonies out *Origen*, and *Ambroſe*.

3. They object. That by the particle [ſole] the Fathers do exclude ceremoniall works, and not all works, which indeed is unworthy of anſwere, the Law of Ceremonies, being antiquated before their daies.

4. Seeing none of theſe will hold, *Franc. à Sancta Clara* produceth another Rule out of *Aquinas*, in *Quæſt. de veritate*, Quæſt. 14. artic. 5. ad 12. *When any thing that is common to many, is attributed eſpecially to one, that comes to paſſe, either becauſe it is moſt eminent, or becauſe it is firſt in it*, which Rule might ſerve with ſome reaſon as applyed to this purpoſe, for anſwer both to Scripture-texts, and teſtimonies of Fathers, in caſe they only ſaid, that we are Juſtified by Faith. But when the Scripture doth not barely give it to Faith, but denies it to works; and the Fathers do not only ſay that *Faith Juſtifies*, but that *Faith only Juſtifies*, and particularly exclude works, this Rule therefore can do nothing here. So that I conclude, that Faith hath its office in Juſtification, which other graces have not, which is not by you denied; And that this office is aſcribed to Faith in words implying an inſtrumentality, as in Scriptures, ſo in the *Fathers*, an no other office peculiar can be found for it, according to your Confeſſion, therefore according to Scriptures and *Fathers*, it Juſtifies as an inſtrument. Before I go off this head, let me mind you of that of Dr. *Prideaux*, which you may find *Lect.* 5. *de Juſtific. Pag.* 146. * *It did not*, ſaith he, *pleaſe* Arminius, (*as his interpreter* Corvinus *ſays*) *that Faith ſhould be called the inſtrumentall cauſe of our Juſtification*; Whereupon he addreſſes himſelf to him: *Tell us in good earneſt, O* Arminius! *how it Juſtifies?* May not I

put

Quando aliquod commune multis tribuitur ſpecialiter alicui, illud provenit, aut quia in illo excellentiſſimè reperitur, aut quia primò reperitur.

Arminio minimè placuit, (ait ejus interpres Corvinus) quod fides dicitur inſtrumentalis Juſtificationis noſtræ cauſa. Bonâ igitur fide dic Armini, pro tuo acumine qua ratione fides Juſtificat.

put the ſame queſtion to you? He ſpeaks for *Arminius*, out of an Epiſtle of his to *Hippolitus à Collibus*, the Palſgrave's Ambaſſadour. *The τὸ credere*, i. e. *the act of Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſſe, and that in a proper, not a Metonymicall ſenſe, as it apprehends the object*, which he there refutes. But it will not ſerve you to anſwer thus, For with you, works juſtifie, and yet you confeſſe that Faith hath its peculiar way and prerogative, which agrees not to works in Juſtification. We muſt either then yeeld that it Juſtifies as an inſtrument, or ſhut it quite out from the office of Juſtification; or plainely confeſſe, we know not what office it hath in this work, notwithſtanding Scripture ſpeaks ſo much of it, and ſtill in thoſe words which in mens common Language denote an inſtrument.

τὸ credere, hoc eſt, actum fidei (dicit) imputari in juſtitiam, idq; proprio ſenſu, non Metonymicè, quatenus objectum apprehendit, in Ep. *ad* Hippolitum à Collibus *principis Palatini legatum.*

The ſecond, *That Faith in Chriſt* quâ *Lord is not the Juſtifying act*, is, with you (as the former) *a notorious novelty*, and comes within the ſame Challenge; And if the Contention be alone about the termes, in caſe it be yeelded, what would you be advantaged? Seeing I doubt not but we may ſay, that it was never *in Terminis*, by the Ancients put to the queſtion, and ſo you in affirming that Faith in Chriſt *quâ Lord* is the Juſtifying act, are in as notorious a novelty; as we, on the other hand in denying it; you can no more find the one, in the Ancients, then your adverſaries can find the other. But if the queſtion be about the thing it ſelf, I doubt not but many teſtimonies may be eaſily produced. In order to which, the ſtate of the queſtion as it is laid down between *Proteſtants* and their adverſaries is to be looked into, which is, Whether *the whole word of God be the object of Juſtifying Faith, or the ſpeciall promiſes of mercy in Chriſt?* Thus *Bellarmine* ſtates it, *Lib.* 1. *de Juſtificatione cap.* 4. and ſaith, that *the* Heretiques *reſtrain it to the promiſe of ſpeciall mercy, but* Catholiques *will have the object of Faith to be as large as the whole word of God.* Here *Proteſtants* yield ſomewhat to *Bellarmine*, & ſomewhat they deny. They yield, that the Faith which Juſtifies, looks upon the whole word of God as its object, that it believes the Hiſtory of the Creation, the narrative of the years of *Mathuſaleh*, the floud of *Noah*, that it acknowledges the equity of all Gods Commands, and a neceſſity of obedience, but not as Juſtifying. We willingly grant that Juſtifying Faith is an obedientiall affiance, yet it is the affiance, and not

the

the obedience, nor yet the aſſent to truths formerly mentioned, or the like, that acts in Juſtification. Your ſelf ſay, that obedience is only the *modification of Faith*, in the firſt act of Juſtification, and the reforming party of *Proteſtant* Divines ſay the ſame in the conſummation of it. Now that theſe promiſes of ſpeciall mercy, or the blood of Chriſt held out in the free promiſes, is the ſpeciall object of Faith, in this act of Juſtification, and that it juſtifies as it applies ſuch promiſes, and doth intereſt the Soul in this blood, may I ſuppoſe be made good by diverſe teſtimonies. Let that of *Ambroſe* be conſulted, *Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 6. de *Jacobo* & vitâ beatâ. *Non habeo unde gloriari in operibus meis poſſum, non habeo unde me jactem, & ideo gloriabor in Chriſtro. Non gloriabor quia juſtus ſum, ſed gloriabor quia redemptus ſum, Gloriabor non quia vacuus peccati ſum, ſed quia remiſſa ſunt peccata. Non gloriabor quia profui, neque quia profuit mihi quiſquam, ſed quia pro me advocatus apud patrem Chriſtus eſt, ſed quia pro me Chriſti ſanguis effuſus eſt. Facta eſt mihi culpa mea, merces redemptionis, per quam mihi Chriſtus advenit. Propter me Chriſtus mortem guſtavit, fructuoſior culpa quam innocentia. Innocentia arrogantem me fecerat, culpa ſubjectum reddidit.* And that of *Gregory* in *Ezek. Hom.* 7. *Juſtus igitur advocatus noſter, juſtos nos defendet in judicio, quia & nos iſpos cognoſcimus & accuſamus injuſtos. Non ergo in fletibus, non in actibus noſtris, ſed in advocati noſtri allegatione confidamus.* And this I am ſure, is within Chriſts Prieſtly and not his Kingly office. That of *Bernard* alſo *ſuper Cantic.* Sect. 23. *Sufficit mihi ad omnem juſtitiam ſolum habere propitium cui ſoli peccavi*, & Sect. 23. *Ego fidenter quod ex me mihi deeſt, uſurpo mihi ex viſceribus Domini, quoniam Miſericordiâ affluunt, nec deſunt foramina per quæ affluant; Memorabor juſtitiæ tuæ ſolius, ipſa enim eſt mea, nempe factus es mihi tu Juſtitia à Deo. Nunquid mihi verendum eſt, ne non una ambobus ſufficiat? Non eſt pallium breve quod ſecundum prophetam non poteſt operire duos; Juſtitia tua juſtitia in æternum, & te pariter, & me apperiet larga & æterna juſtitia.* That of *Auſtine*, lib. 3. de Trinit. Cap. 20. *Fides ad beatitudinem neceſſaria in Chriſto definita eſt, qui in carne reſurrexit à mortuis, non enim niſi per illum liberabitur quisquam à Diaboli dominatu per remiſſionem peccatorum*; And *Nyſſenus* lib. de vita Moſis. *Caput eorum quæ in profeſſione Chriſtiana credimus eſt firmâ rectaq; fide*

fide in paſſionem illius reſpicere qui pro nobis paſſus eſt. That paſſage which *Chemnitius* quotes out of the life of *Bernard* is obſerveable, Being at the poynt of death, and in an extaſie of Spirit, judging himſelf to be before Gods tribunall, and Sathan over againſt him preſent charging him with wicked accuſations, and the Man of God was to ſpeak for himſelf, not at all afraid or troubled, he ſaid, *Fateor, non ſum dignus ego, nec propriis poſſum meritis regnum obtinere cœlorum. Cæterum duplici jure illud obtinens dominus meus, hæreditate ſcilicet patris, & merito paſſionis, altero ipſe contentus, alterum mihi donat: Ex cujus dono, jure illud mihi vendicans non confundor. Ita hoc verbo confuſus eſt inimicus, &c.* The ſame Author tels us of an exhortation of *Anſelme* to a dying Brother, ſet out as a directory for the viſit of the ſick, ready to give up the Ghoſt, which is almoſt wholly ſpent in leading the dying perſon to the death of Chriſt, He concludes, *Age ergo, dum in te eſt anima tua, ei ſemper gratias, & in hac ſola morte totam fiduciam tuam conſtitue, Huic morti te totum committes, hac morte te totum contege, eiq; te totum evolve. Et ſi dominus te voluerit judicare, dic, Domine, Domini mortem noſtri Jeſu Chriſti objicio inter me & te, & judicium tuum, aliter tecum non contendo; ſi dixerit quod merueris damnationem, dic, Mortem Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, objicio inter me, & mala merita mea, ipſiuſq; dignissimæ paſſionis meritum affero pro merito, quod ego habere debuiſſem, & heu non habeo.* Many more paſſages may be found in *Chemnitius* out of *Anſelme*, *Gerſon*, *Bernard*, and others, purpoſely brought to make this good, that the ſpeciall promiſes of mercy in Chriſt through his blood, is the ſpeciall object of Faith in Juſtification, largely diſclaming any act of Faith, as terminated on any other object in the word, to Juſtifie. I ſhall conclude with that which was quoted before by *Davenant*, out of *Thomas Aquinas*, *In ipſa Juſtificatione peccatoris, non eſt neceſſe ut cogitentur cæteri articuli; Sed ſolum cogitetur Deus, peccata remittens.*

In this work it ſelf of the juſtification of a ſinner, it is not neceſſary, that other articles be thought up, but that God be thought on pardoning ſin.

As for your laſt, of the intereſt in mans obedience, in Juſtification, as continued, and conſummate in judgment; In caſe you could bring forth the diſtinction out of the *Fathers*, and

make it appear that thy exclude all in man except Faith, in *Juſtification* begun; but take in *works* in Juſtification *compleat*, and *conſummate*, you had done ſomewhat. But to put your adverſaries upon it, to prove that the Fathers overthrow this diſtinction, when you do not ſhew that they any where aſſert it, is ſcarce equall dealing, yet you cannot here go away cleare. What judge you of the paſſages but nowquoted? If *Bernard* had been of your judgement, when he took himſelf, to be before Gods tribunal, he would not have contented himſelf alone with the ſufferings of Chriſt; but muſt have put himſelf upon it, to have brought out a liſt (as large as the Phariſees) of his works of obedience. Neither would *Anſelme* in his Directory have taught Prelates, and other Miniſters, to have led perſons, at the point of death, alone to the death of Chriſt, and nothing elſe. What ſay you to that of *Clemens Alexand.* Stromat. 7 quoted by *Eckhardus*, pag. 391. *Per fidem ſolummodo efficitur fidelis perfectus?* And that of *Hilary*, quoted by *Davenant* de Juſtitia habit. *cap.* 29 *pag.* 377? having urged theſe words out of Canon 8. in *Matth. pag.* 164. *A chriſto remiſſum eſt quod lex laxare non poterat; fides enim ſola juſtificat*, he addes another quotation out of *lib.* 20. de Trinitate. *Juſtum fides conſummat, ſecundum quod dictum eſt, credidit* Abraham *deo, & reputatum eſt ei ad juſtitiam*, and then Comments himſelf upon both theſe quotations. *Jeſuites are wont to aſcribe juſtification to faith, but not to faith alone*, Hilary *taxes this error, when he ſaith, faith alone juſtifies: for they attribute the beginning of juſtification to faith, but not the conſummation, but* Hilary *far otherwiſe. Faith conſummates the juſt.* So that your Reader may ſee that *Hilary* in *Davenants* judgement, is full againſt you. And doubtleſs he will ſtill judge it, matter of wonder, that in the cloſe of your Century of witneſſes, you ſay that *Davenant* moſt fully of all ſpeaks your thoughts; If he agree with you, no man (no not Mr. *Crandon* himſelf) I think diſſents from you.

I confeſs that I come neerer to you, than he, as in words he expreſſes himſelf, as you may ſee at large, *de Juſtit. habit.* cap. 30. pag. 397, 398. and yet I cannot be brought to agree with you; And ſeeing I am brought in by you, in your confeſſion, *pag.* 456. as the firſt man after you Century of witneſſes is ended, as voting with you in theſe words, [Mr. *Bl. in his late Treatiſe*

of

of the Covenant is so full in asserting the conditionality of repentance and obedience, that he spends whole Chapters upon it, and answers the objections of the Antinomians against it, cap. 14. and 15 and 6, 7, 8.] I am put to it, to let the Reader know how I explain my self, seeing you do it not, By which it will appear, that nothing that I have said, in any of those Chapters by you quoted (notwithstanding I assert such conditionality as you mention) will serve at all to strengthen your opinion for the interest of works in justification, yet for ought I know they may be as much for you, as the most of those that are by you produced. You may see that I distinguish of conditions serviceable to man in his return to God. 1. For recovery of his lost estate of happiness. 2. For the repair, or new frame of his qualifications depraved and spoiled, *cap.* 11. *pag.* 74. The condition immediately serviceable for mans return to God reconciled in Christ, I say is *Faith*, in the page quoted. The condition respecting mans reparation in his qualifications to hold up communion with God, I say is *Repentance*, cap. 14. pag. 93. This then, with me enters not the act of justification, but is, the justified mans way to bliss and glory. And when Repentance is at the highest, and obedience at the best, it is not repentance, nor obedience; but the bloud of Christ, in which faith alone interests us, that must be our discharge. So that, if I may take the boldness to interpose my thoughts, as to that multitude of quotations which you have produced, for the interest of works in justification; I think for the greatest part, they labour of that Fallacy, called *Ignoratio Elenchi.* Put them into Syllogistical form, and the Reader shall find, that they do not conclude the thing in question. They very fully speak a necessity of good works to *Salvation* (which is the unanimous judgement of all Orthodox writers) and the question is about their interest in *Justification:* Which two in the judgement of Protestant writers very much differ, as you may see in Mr. *Ball*, Treatise of the Covenant, *pag.* 18. Whose testimony I have produced at large, *p.* 434. *&c.* and thither I here refer you, Where you may see the sole interest of faith, the instrumentall efficiency, or causality of it, with an utter deniall of any interest of works in this of justification. So that he alone may speak for all; that the acknowledgement of the interest of works, according to the tenor of the Covenant, as a way ap-

pointed of God for attainment of glory, doth not argue any intereſt at all of works in the work of juſtification.

But to return to that from which theſe quotations have cauſed this ſhort digreſſion. I think you might have ſpared thoſe words, *If I were on one ſide, and all the Divines in* England *on the other, there is yet the ſame reaſon to prefer all the firſt Churches before all them, as there is to prefer all them before me. In a word, I ſhall ever think him more culpably ſingular, who differeth from Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, and all his Church for* 1200. or 1400. *yeers, then he that differeth from any party now living, and differeth not from them forementioned,* Unleſs you could make it better appear, that Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, and the Church for this ſpace of time, were more cleerly for you. It is the Churches Teſtimony, that is now our buſineſs; and if the Reader have no more then *Chemnitius* bare word, affirming with ſo much confidence, as we have heard, that all ages have been againſt you, it is enough againſt your bare word, that all former ages have been for you.

You now ſee my thoughts, how they ſtand upon the Reading of that part of your Apology, in which I am concerned. Though it be above my hopes to give you ſatisfaction, yet others I doubt not wil be more flexible in their opinion. What you wil pleaſe to do further, I know not, it is enough that I underſtand my own mind; which is (ſo far as I can before-hand reſolve) not to intermeddle further, and whatſoever I ſhall hear from you, to impoſe ſilence on my ſelf. You have drawn me out to ſpeak what is here ſaid, in my own juſt defence. If this will not do it, I ſhall think it will not be done. Let me requeſt that Chriſtian Candor, that the Common cauſe may not ſuffer; and that you will not dwell on literall miſtakes, or unaptneſs, (as you may conceive, ſometimes) of the phraſe, but take that which you ſhall judge to be my full meaning, which I have made my buſineſs, as fully as I can, to make known. I have no more to make yours, or the Readers trouble, but ſhall leave all to your candid interpretation, and his impartiall cenſure, and not onely ſubſcribe, but with unfeigned reſolution (by the help of grace) remain in acknowledgement of your manifold eminent graces,

Your true affectionated Friend, Brother, and fellow labourer,

THOMAS BLAKE.

BRITISH MUSEUM

An Alphabeticall Table relating to the chief heads handled in this Treatise.

A.

Abraham. Page.

WHether any Sacraments from Adam to him 24
The question discussed in severall propositions. Ibid. &c.

Acts
Of God are entitled to man, and the acts of man to God in Scripture 451

Actions.
Are denominated good or evill from the Law onely—— 613

Adam
Was not Created an infant in understanding 15

Admission
Of men of yeers to Baptisme examined 101
The way of the Primitives in it laid open ibid.
Admission by a Church-Covenant examined 101
Admission to the Lords Supper, is no act of jurisdiction —— 253
Admission to the Lords Supper not to be exempted from cognizance of Church power 273. &c.
Rules for admission to Sacraments more explicite in the Old Testament —— 92

Antiquity.
Who they be that make the higheſt claimes to it, as being on their party 652
Chemnitius his thoughts of the judgement of Antiqnity, concerning the Protestants doctrine of justification 651, 653
Quere's put concerning Mr. Brs appeal to Antiquity, in point of Controversie 653, &c.
Proofs from Antiquity, for the instrumentality faith 628, &c.
Evasions of these testimonies examined—— 661
Proofs from Antiquity that faith in Christ as pardoning sin is the justifying act. —— 633
Proofs from Antiquity against the interest of mans obedience in justification as consummate. Apostates. (665
Application of the Seales of the Covenant to them, is a putting a Seale to a blank 20

Assent
Essentiall in Faith 502
It must be firm 503
Unlimitted ibid.

Assurance.
Of faith is possible 496
What sins cloud it 394

Astrology.
Judiciall Astrology censured 39, &c.

Arminianisme.
The Author vindicated from it 158, &c.

B.

Mr. Ball.

HIs testimony of the instrumentality of faith in justification 434
That works do not justifie ibid.
That the New Covenant hath its conditions ib.
That repentance is a condition of the Covenant 435
No condition of justification 436

Baptisme.
Johns Baptisme, in the whole of it of divine institution 64
Contempt, and neglect of Baptisme censured 68
An improvement is to be made of it 72
The sin of Covenant Parents destroyes not the Childs right to Baptisme 97
Visibility of interest the Churches guide in admission to Baptisme 104. 110
How far Faith and Repentance antiently were required in Baptisme 109
Their grounds, or reasons, who delayed Baptisme in the Primitive times 110

Their way of admiſſion of the Catechumeni *to Baptiſme* 111
Over much rigour in admiſſion to Baptiſme, hinders the progreſs of the Goſpell 112
The admiſſion of ſome to Baptiſme in prudence may be delayed 113
Papiſts expect not grace for, but a convenient diſpoſition to grace, in the perſon to be Baptized 111
The reſtraint of right to Baptiſme——a breach in the Church of Chriſt 181
Baptiſme, a leading Church-privilege 161
In what ſenſe Baptiſme works what it figures 383
Babtiſme engages to the firſt work of regeneration 369
The Bloud and Spirit of Chriſt, are not alwayes applyed in it 381
Dangers attending the reſtraint of Baptiſme to the regenerate 551

Baptized.

A man unbaptized, is bound to believe in Jeſus Chriſt for juſtification 144
The Author vindicated from a ſuppoſed aſſertion of the contrary ibid.
Titles given by the Apoſtle to Baptized perſons do not argue they were alwayes anſwered with inherent grace 149
Upon what grounds Simon Magus *was Baptized* 160, &c.

Believers.

A title in Scripture not proper to the juſtifyed

Believing.

What ordinarily meant by believing, in the Hiſtory of the Acts. 177
The diſtinction of believing Chriſt, and believing in Chriſt groundleſs ibid.

Bloud.

Faith in the bloud of Chriſt onely juſtifies 766
This aſſertion quit from danger 582
Bloud and Spirit may be diſtinguiſhed, but muſt not be divided 367

C.

Call.

AN outward call aſſerted 169

Calvin.

Vindicated 118. 550

Catholick

And univerſall, in Authors uſe of them, diſtinguiſhed 155

Chemnitius.

His teſtimony for the inſtrumentality of the word and faith in juſtification 490

See Antiquity.

Chriſt.

The Covenant of works was without reference to Chriſt as Mediator 10
Whether the Covenant of works be made null, or repealed by Chriſt 19
Faith in his bloud onely juſtifies 566
Faith hath reſpect to whole Chriſt, to every part and piece of his Mediatorſhip 562
Intereſt in him, intereſts us in all other priviledges 458
Scripture ſpeaks of receiving Chriſt, *and not of the Species of Chriſt onely* 459
The healing of our nature, and the removall of our guilt is his work 366
Faiths inſtrumentality in receiving Chriſt being granted, it's inſtrumentality in juſtification cannot be denyed 441
Communication of titles between Chriſt and his Church 448. 449

Chriſtians.

Unregenerates are reall and not equivocall members of viſible Churches 153
Humane authority vouched for it ibid. &c.
Chriſtian, a title in Scripture not proper to the juſtified 149

Church-Membership.

What gives right to it 201, 102

Circumciſion.

How Infants were ſaved before Circumciſion 26, 27, 28
Severall propoſitions for clearing of the truth 24
Circumciſion and Baptiſme engaged to the firſt work of regeneration 369
The right of Circumciſion implyed the propagation of corruption 368
Circumciſion was no earnall badge 425

Cloud.

Whether two or onely one Cloud with Iſrael in the wilderneſs 521
No ordinary one, but ſupernaturall 522
The motion of it guided by an Angell ibid.
The form of it in appearance as a pillar ib.

The

The use of it twofold.
As Israels *guide* 522
As Israels *guard* ibid.
It was of the nature of a Sacrament 525
No standing Sacrament 526

Communicants.

The Lords Supper must be administred for their edification 199

Communication

Of titles between Christ and his Church 448

Conclusions.

Desperate conclusions often inferred from right principles 579

Condition.

The great condition to which Baptisme engages is not a prerequisite to the essence, and being of Baptisme 143, 44
The Authors meaning cleered 145
In what sense faith is the condition of the promise of remission of sin 171
Actuall existence not necessary to the being of conditions in a Covenant 462
One and the same thing, is not the condition of both parties in a Covenant 632

Confirmation

Preferred by the Church of Rome *before Baptisme* 528
Perfects what Baptisme begins ibid.
The matter of it —— }
The form }
The fruit } 529
Minister } *at consecration*
Ceremonies } *at administration.*
Arguments evincing it to be no Sacrament 530
The Apostles imposition of hands, no proof of it 530
The ancient use of it degenerated 531

Consecration

Respects not elements, but participants 58
Whether the word which gives being to Sacraments be Consecratorium, *or* Concionatorium ibid.

Contradiction.

The Author acquit from any 447

Conversion.

The Lords Supper with the word, as an Appendant to it, may be serviceable towards Conversion 200
Arguments evincing it 200, 201, &c.
Whether the Lords Supper may be stiled a Converting Ordinance 211
Explicatory propositions ibid. &c.
The Lords Supper doth not necessarily suppose a through conversion 217

Covenant.

Law and Covenant are not to be confounded 598
Keeping Covenant, failing in Covenant, and forfeiture of it, to be distinguished 392
The Covenant falling, Sacraments annexed fall with it 18, &c.
Where God denies his Covenant, there the seal must not be granted 20
The Covenant people of God, the adæquate subject of Sacraments 74
All relation to God in tendency to salvation is founded in the Covenant ibid.
Interest in Sacraments, is upon the account of the Covenant 75, &c.
God enters a Covenant with his people exactly and properly so called 79
The word Covenant asserted ibid.
The thing it self asserted 80
in the essentials of it 80, 81
in the solemnities 81
Arguments evincing a Covenant between God and man in its proper nature 82
Covenant and seal are commensurate 120

Covenant outward and inward.

This distinction examined 83
The Author vindicated in it 124
The outward Covenant is most properly a Covenant 83, &c.
To it belongs the definition of a Covenant, ibid.
It usually bears the name in Scripture 84
Men enjoy privileges of Ordinances, and interest in Sacraments, upon account of the outward Covenant 86
Scripture characters of men in Covenant 115

Covenant God.

Gods Covenant with his people not equivocall 80
Men of a visible profession timely and really not equivocally in Covenant with God 128

Covenant of works

Passe between God and man in an immediate way, without any reference to Christ as Me-
di-

diatour 10, 11
Whether this Covenant be made null, or repealed by Christ. 19

Covenant of Grace.

Righteousnes of faith the great promise of it 414
Duty and condition in it are one and the same 641,643
It requires and accepts sincerity 637
Arguments evincing it vindicated 639
Mr. Cramdons Arguments against Mr. Br. herein answered 645

Covenant absolute Conditionall.

Arguments offered against an absolute Covenant 626
Faith and Repentance are mans conditions, not Gods in the proper conditionall Covenant 626

Covenant Old and New.

Sacraments under the old and new Covenant one and the same 25

Disciple. D.

A Title in Scripture, not alwayes proper to the justified 149

Discipline.

Church-discipline asserted 266, &c.
Objections answered 268

Dogmaticall Faith

Is a true Faith 176
Entitles to Baptisme 103

The Authors Arguments proving

That a Dogmaticall Faith, or a Faith short of justifying, entitles to Baptisme, vindicated. 120, 121, &c
17. Arguments added for the proof of it 161
Arguments from humane authorities against a Dogmaticall Faith examined 147

Dogs.

Dogs and Swine what they mean 260

E.

Eldership.

Allegations for the power of an Eldership in admission to the Sacrament 252
These taken into consideration 253
Ruling Elders vindicated 270, &c.
Grotius his testimony concerning them 171

Election

And the Covenant of grace not commensurate 124

Elect.

Restriction of the Covenant to the the Elect regenerate confounds the Covenant, the and conditions of it 134
Exceptions against it answsred 135, 136
Restraint of Covenant to the regenerate, denies any breach of Covenaut 138
Exception against it examined. ibid, &c.

Elements.

No continuall holines in Sacramentall Elements. 324
Their touch or abode makes not holy 315

Engagement.

Answer to Sacramentall engagements necessary to Saluation 387
Arguments evincing it 389
Sacraments without spirituall profit to those that lived in breach of Covenant 18
Sacraments are meer shadowes, and empty signes where conscience answers not to the engagements 389, &c.
Sacraments are aggravations of sin, and hightnings of judgements, when conscience answers not to Sacramentall engagements 390
When conscience answers not to Sacramentall engagements, men subscribe to the equity of their own condemnation 391
When it is that conscience answers to Sacramentall engagements 392

Equivocall.

Men of a visible profession, really and not equivocally in Covenant with God 128
Gods Covenant with his people, no equivocall Covenant. 80
Scripture language not equivocall 140. 150

Equivocation.

What it is 139

Errors.

Reformers vindicated from a charge of four supposed great errors 438
Protestants vindicated from four supposed great errors. 452

Erroneous.

Persons in an incapacity to receive any benefit from the Lords Supper 236, &c.

Evidence.

Men in grace often want assuring evidence of grace 190
Grounds laid down 190, 191, &c.

Eunuch
His Baptism enquired into 176

F.

Faith
THe alone grace that interests us in the righteousnes of the Covenant 432
All forein reformers make not faith a full persuasion 439, &c.
Whether the act, or habit of faith, doth justifie?—— 442
These phrases to be justified by faith, and faith justifies, are one and the same—— 444
Faiths instrumentality in justification asserted by Scriptures ibid.
The unanimous consent of Protestant writers in it—— 445, &c.
There is somewhat of efficiency in mans faith for justification—— 447
How Christ dwels in our hearts by faith 450
Faith doth more then qualifie the subject to be a fit patient to be justified 460
More then a bare presence of faith is required to justification 468
In what sense the Gospell through faith is efficacious for justification 481
Christians must bring their faith to triall 492
The absolute necessity of faith ibid.
Manifold benefits of it 494. &c.
The humbled soul the proper seat of faith 498, &c.
Faith hath its seat in the will, as well as in the understanding 504
It is held out in words in Scripture implying affiance, trust, &c. ibid.
Faith defined 505
Faith far under-values all earthly things respective to Christ 510
Faith is against all whatsoever is against Christ 512
It suffers no lust to divide from Christ ibid.
Faith in Christ quâ Lord is not the justifying act—— 554
The distinction of fides quæ, *and* fides quâ *asserted* 565, 566
Protestant writers guilty of no cheat in it ibid.
Arguments evincing that faith in the bloud of Christ onely justifies 566. &c.
Faith dogmaticall,
See dogmaticall.
Faith justifying,
See justification.
Faiths instrumentality,
See instrument.
Fathers
And Councils often too rigorous in their Rules respective to Church discipline 112
Queres put touching the authority of the Fathers in Controversies—— 653, &c.
Mr. Firmin
His Appendix as to the latitude of Infant-Baptisme examined 94, &c.
The Authhor vindicated 95, 96
His Appendix as to admission of men of yeers examined 104, &c.
Advertisments given to Mr. Br. *touching his undertakings for him* 180
Their disagreement 180, &c.
Food.
Ordinary and quickening food differenced 218
The word as well as the Sacrament is food.
—— ibid.
Forum Dei
Mr. Brs. *distinction of* Forum Dei, *and* Forum Ecclesiæ *examined* 141
Form
A precise form of words not of the essence of Sacraments 59

G.

Gesture
NO one Gesture of necessary observation in receiving of the Sacrament 310
God
His great goodnes in condescension to mans weakness in institution of Sacraments 52, &c.
He is the Author of all Sacraments, and Sacramentall rites 63
He is to prescribe in his own worship 65
He alone must distinguish his servants in relation from others 65, 66
He onely gives efficacy to Sacraments 66
He onely can seale his promise 66, 67
His great goodnes, and the tender care of Christ in condescension to our weakness 349
His compassion to us should move us to compassionate our selves 551

Gospell.
Sacraments lead us unto Christ in his Priestly Office. 567

Grace.
Papists speak doubtfully of any work of inherent grace infused in Baptisme 377
Protestants deny any such infusion of grace in Baptisme 378
The Fathers acknowledge no such infusion of grace in Baptisme ibid.
Common grace is reall 132

H.

Heresie
IN the Parent divests not the Child from Church-privileges 99

Holiness.
Covenant-holiness must not be confounded with inward holiness 148, 149
The doctrine of Covenant-holiness more antient then Zuinglius 117
Calvin *and* Beza *not the inventers though the promoters of it* 118

Mr. Humphreys.
His Treatise of a free admission to the Lords Supper 247

I.

NAtural Idiots uncapable of benefit by the Lords Supper 229

Ignorance, Ignorant
In Covenant Parents divests not the Child of Church-privileges 99
Grossely ignorant ones in an incapacity of benefit by the Lords Supper 230
Ignorance distinguished ibid.

Image.
An Image less like the Pattern, is an Image. 612

Impenitence
And unbelief in professed Christians are violations of the Covenant of grace 622
Arguments evincing it 624, &c.

Infants
Of confederate Parents put no bar to their Baptisme 95
They are uncapable of benefit by the Lords Supper. 226
The different practice of Antiquity ibid.
Schoolemen divided about it ibid.
The present practice of the Church of Rome *in it* 227
Whether Infants were saved by their Parents faith, and how before circumcision 26, 27, 28
Severall propositions laid down 29, &c.

Infant-Baptisme.
Severall benefits of it 185, &c.
See Baptisme.

Infirmities.
Men Covenant not with God to be above all infirmities 392
Meer infirmities no Covenant-breaches ibid.
Their happiness whose sins are not above infirmities 393
Sins above infirmities and towards presumption ibid.
See Sin.

Institution.
A word of institution necessary to the being of Sacraments 58
Repetition and explanation of this word of institution singularly usefull 59
All Sacramentall rites must be of divine institution

Instrument. Faith.
The instrumentality of Faith in justification asserted 437
Scripture Texts holding out the instrumentality of Faith, as in other actions, so in justification 444
Whether the [illegible]ion of the principall cause, and of the instrument in Morall operations is alwayes one 445
The unanimous consent of Protestant writers, that Faith is an instrument ibid. &c.
Faiths instrumentality makes not man the efficient cause of his justification 438. 464
Faiths instrumentality in receiving Christ being granted, its instrumentality in justification cannot be denied 441
Faith is the instrument of the soul, and not of it self in receiving Christ 443
Instruments of meer reception, *and farther* operation *distinguished* 448
Faith an instrument of the proper reception of Christ 460
It is the instrument both of God and man in the work of justification 448. 487

The grant of the New Covenant, is not an instrument of justification solely sufficient 466
Concauses instrumentall have efficacy one from another 470
Instruments Cooperative, *or* Passive 474
Whether the word be a passive *instrument, or* Cooperative *with the Spirit* ibid.
An instrumentall efficiency ascribed to Faith respective to Salvation 486
Arguments for the instrumentality of faith in justification 485
Proofs from Antiquity for its instrumentality in justification 628, &c.

See Faith.

Justification.

The relative change in it necessarily presupposes a reall 447
God and men not co-ordinate causes in it 449
In justification of man, God acts not without man 446
Quæres put, in what sense the grant of the New Covenant is said to be solely instrumentall in the work of justification 478
Arguments against the sole sufficiency of the grant of the New Covenant for justification 489
Justification by Gospell grant, and by the sentence of the Judge, how they differ 556, 557
Justification at the day of judgement not specifically distinct from that which precedse. 558
The Father appoints the termes of justification and salvation 559
Paul *treats directly and industriously of justification by faith* 576

Justifying

Faith which is short of justifying gives title to Baptisme 163, &c.
Severall arguments vindicated 120, &c.
Exceptions examined 143
Additionall arguments to prove it 161
Covenanting and justifying not Synonima's 135, 136.
None able to Baptize, if justifying faith onely give admission 160

Jurisdiction

Admission to the Lords Supper is no act of jurisdiction 253
Arguments evincing it ibid. &c.
Objections answered 262

K.

Knowledge

A necessary prerequisite in faith 500
Knowledge distinguished 501

See Ignorance.

L.

Law

And Covenant are not to be confounded 598

Law *Morall.*

Arminians, Socinians, and Papists oppose the perfection of the Morall Law 601
Authorities of Protestant writers, for the perfection of the Morall Law 602
Arguments evincing the perfection of the Morall Law 603
Objections answered 605
There is no sin that is not condemned in the Morall Law 603
In what sense the preceptive part of the Morall Law is a perfect rule of righteousness 605, &c.
Actions are denominated good or bad, from the Law onely 613
Men are denominated really, and not equivocally righteous, that imperfectly obey the Morall Law 614
The Law commanding duty, and the end of the duty are not opposite, but subordinate 614

Law nature.

What meant by the time of the Law of nature 24
No Sacraments appointed of God, during the time called the Law of nature 24, &c.
Scripture silence a probable argument 26
Jesuites arguments herein examined. ibid.
The preceptive part of the Law of nature delivered to Moses, *and as used by Christ, whether they differ* 600

Leiturgy.

Divine ordinances must not stand or fall upon the want, or fruition of any set leiturgy whatsoever 308
Leiturgy of the Church of England *taken into* con-

consideration ibid. &c.
1. As to the work it srlf 308
2. As to the sanction put upon it 309

Life.

What meant by it in the Covenant of works 11
Not barely an animall life, ibid. &c.
The tree of life had not any naturall power to answer its name 12

Lord.

Faith in Christ qua Lord, is not the justifying act 554
The position at large discussed 555, &c.

Lords Supper.

See Sacraments.
Supper.

Lunatick

Persons uncapable of any benefit by the Lords Supper 229

M.

Man

His first originall is in sin 363
Arguments evincing it 364
In mans restitution, his nature must be healed, and his guilt removed 366
The healing of his nature, and the removall of guilt is the work of Christ 366

Manna.

Whence it hath its name 523
The time it continued with Israel 524
Miraculously provided ibid.
A fable concerning it—— ibid.
Of a Sacramentall nature 525
No standing Sacrament 526

Meanes.

Their necessity for our help in the way of faith and obedience 17
Objections answered 17, 18

Mediatour.

See Christ.

Metonymies

Frequent in Scripture 572

Marriage.

The Matter, Form, Minister. } 540
Reasons evincing it to be no Sacrament 541

Minister.

Allegations for a Ministers sole power in admission to the Sacrament 251
Inconveniences objected against it answered. —— 262
A Ministers prudence in this work, to see with more eyes then his own 272
Where an Eldership is erected to make use of them—— ibid.
To make scrutiny into mens knowledge with all tenderness 273
Not to refuse, but upon known crimes ibid.
When he cannot in this do what he would, he is to do what he is able 274

Ministerial

Dispensation of Sacraments a part of the Ministeriall function 277
Whether Ministeriall dispensation be of the essence of Sacraments 277, &c.
Gospell order transgrest, when Sacraments are not dispenced by a Ministeriall hand 278
Doctor Abbots, and Mr. Hookers judgement in it—— ibid.

Mixt.

Lawfull to communicate in mixt congregations 314
Arguments evincing it ibid. &c.

Morall.

Perfection, or imperfection is in reference to a rule 592
Duties naturally Morall bind all 195
Where a positive command is given, there is a Morall tye to obedience. ibid

See Law.

Moses.

Baptisme into him what 526

N.

Names

Given by God not empty titles 12

Nature

What meant by the times of the Law of nature? —— 24

Necessity

Of Sacraments asserted 285, &c.
Arguments evincing it 288, &c.
The kind of degree of the necessity of Sacraments enquired into 289

Not absolutely necessary to Salvation 289
Objections answered 290
Explicatory Rules delivered in it 294, &c.
A greater degree of necessity in the initiatory leading Sacrament then in that which follows 298
Arguments evincing it ibid. &c.

O.

Obedience

Mans sin disobligeth him not from obedience 195, 196, 197

Obligation.

Mans Obligation of himself unto God implies Gods mutuall obligation 130

Oblige

Mans inability for duty, doth not disoblige from duty 197

Orders

Their number in the Church of Rome, *and their divisions* 538
Most of this number doubted by themselves, whether they be Sacraments ibid.
The Matter, Form, Effect, Minister —— 539
Reasons evincing it to be no Sacrament ib.

Ordinances

All outward Ordinances are for the Church in fieri and not onely in facto 189
Sacraments must have the Honour of divine Ordinances —— 68

Originall sin

Asserted —— 363
Distinguished into peccatum originans & originatum 365
Originall sin not a meer want of primitive integrity, but attended with universall defilement ibid. &c.

Oyle

Anointing with Oyle, Jam. 14, 15.
What it means 536, 537
Queres put to those that would revive this practice 537

P.

Parables.

Christ speaking in Parables what it meaneth 64

Pardon

Closing with God for pardon is not to pardon a mans self 452

Passive

Neither believing, nor receiving are to be judged meerly passive 442
In what sense faith passive in justification 476, &c.

Pemble

Not sole, and singular in asserting the word to be a passive instrument 476
He is large in reasons of it 475

Penance

The parts of it
Contrition, Confession, Satisfaction —— 531, 532
Papists agree not what that is in Penance that makes up a Sacrament 533
Arguments evincing it to be no Sacrament ib.

People.

Allegations for their power examined 252, 264

Perfection

Of the subject, and perfection of parts respective to the universality of the object distinguished 586

Pighius

A learned Papist, with divers others, joynes with us in the doctrine of justification 440

Pope

He hath his visible pardoner as well as others 464

Prayer

A necessary means of faiths nourishment 509

Priest

The several functions of Christ as Priest, King, Prophet, are to be distinguished, but not divided 562

Priestly

Levitical types lead us unto Christ in his Priestly office 566

Privileges

A faith short of justifying entitles to visible privileges. 161

Profession

Men of a visible profession truly and really in Covenant with God 128

Profession of faith engages to a lively working faith 172, &c.

Promise.

That which is the condition of the thing promised, is not the condition of the Seal. 173

Exceptions against it examined. ibid.

Gospell promises are a savour of death unto many 469

Protestants.

Vindicated from four supposed great errors 452

The author is confest to appear in the common cause of Protestants ibid.

R.

Rainbow.

Defined 516

It had respect to a Covenant improperly so called 517

It was an instituted sign ibid.

Correspondencies between it and the promise 518

How far it was Sacramentall ibid.

How far it fals short ibid 519

Reall

Covenants may be broke by men in Covenant 138

Common grace is reall 132

Men of a visible profession really in Covenant with God 128

Regenerate

Duties of positive institution do not onely bind the regenerate 195

Repentance.

How prerequired in Baptisme 108

Repentance and Faith

Are mans conditions not Gods in the proper conditionall Covenant 626

Right

Fundamentall, and actuall distinguished 88

The distinction cleered

In civill immunities 88

Ecclesiasticall privileges 89

They must be both written 90

Right unto, a bar to detain from Sacraments not alwayes expres 91

Righteous

Men are so denominated, really and not equivocally that imperfectly obey the Law 614

Righteousnes.

Non reatus is not righteousnes 588

Imperfect righteousnes is no contradiction 589

Righteousnes as well as holines is intended and remitted ib.

Righteousnes and holines in what sense commonly used 592

Righteousnes in an imperfect conformity to the Law asserted 595

There is a partiall reparation of inherent righteousnes in regeneration 611

That righteousnes which the Covenant requires the Sacraments appendant to it seal 413

Righteousnes. Christ.

The naturall righteousnes of Christ is not our justification 439

Whether the righteousnes whereby Christs person was righteous be given to us 453, 454

Queries put concerning this gift of righteousnes

Faith being terminated on Christ, is terminated on his righteousnes 455

To receive his righteousnes for justification no fancy or delusion 456

Righteousnes. Faith.

The Righteousnes of Faith is the great promise of the Covenant of grace 414

This righteousnes is sealed in the Sacraments of the Covenant of grace 415

Proved by Scriptures 417

Confirmed by reasons 418

Explained by rules 419, 420

Bellarmines five objections answered 421, &c.

Propositions explaining the meaning of the righteousnes of Faith 415

So called in opposition to the righteousnes of works required in the Covenant. ibid.

It is the Synechdochically put for the whole of the Covenant that interests us in this righteousnes ibid. &c.

All blessings and privileges flowing from, and following upon this Covenant unto true blessednes are comprized under the righteousnes of faith 416

Christ the Mediatour of the Covenant, is the fountain from whence the blessednes of this righteousnes comes ibid.

Faith considered as an instrument receiving this righteousnes ib.

All must see that they be right principled in the do-

doctrine of the righteousnes of faith 429
Ignorance here was the Jews undoing ib.
Papists mistake in this point 429,&c.
Faith the alone grace that interests us in this righteousnes. 432

Rock.

How it was said to follow Israel 524
The Rock it self was not intended as a sign, but the water flowing out of it 525
Of the nature of a Sacrament ib.
No standing Sacrament 526

Rule.

See Law.

S.

Sacrament.

THe word vindicated —— 2, 3
The reason of the word enquired after 4, 5
The various acceptations of it —— 6, 7, 8
Whether man enjoyed, or was capable of a Sacrament in the state of integrity —— 9
No Sacrament instituted of God during the time called the Law of nature 24, &c.
A Sacrament may be defined —— 32, &c.
The definition of a Sacrament in generall 8
The Apostles definition, Rom. 4, 11 *Vindicated* —— 33, 34
A full definition thence laid down 36
The sign and thing signified in every Sacrament are Analogically one 49, 50
No Sacrament without a promise preceding 56

Sacraments.

The distribution of them 9
God not tyed to Sacraments 30, 31
They are standing Ordinances 294
Reasons evincing it 295, 296
When they are dispensed they may not without weighty reasons be omitted 306
The being of them consists in their us . 317, &c.
Arguments evincing it ib.
The Sacrament of the Supper not exempted 119
Reasons given ibid. &c.
Sacraments have respect both to the change of of our nature, and the removall of our guilt 368
We are to look for no more from Sacraments then God hath put into them 405
As the word teacheth by the ear, so Sacraments by the help of the word teach by the eye 413
Men professing relation to God, may see in Sacraments further engagements, and provocations to holi ibid.
Sacraments are n[illegible]y means of faiths nourishment 508
Sacraments are seale[illegible]trusted in the hand of men —— 192,&c.
Sacraments seal the promise of the Gospell condionally 194
Gospell Sacraments lead us unto Christ in his priestly office 567
All Sacraments from the fall substantially one 424, 426

Saeramentall

Gods condescension in sacramentall signes 52, 53
Sacramentall signes must be explained 56
Mens aptnes to delude themselves in Sacramentall privileges 405
All ages have over-highly advanced Sacramental privileges 406

Sacraments. Covenant.

All interested in Sacraments must come up to the terms of the Covenant 280
Sacraments annexed to the Covenant of works were without relation to Christ 10, 11
That righteousnes which the Covenant requires the Sacraments appendant to it seal —— 413
Sacraments are ever suitable to Covenants 413
All Sacraments must answer to the Covenant to which they are annexed 6
Sacraments without spirituall profit to them that live in breach of Covenant 18
A Covenant falling, Sacraments that are annexed fall with it 18, &c.
Sacraments under the Old and New Covenant one and the same 25
The Covenant people of God, the adequat subject of Sacraments 74
All interest in Sacraments is upon the account of the Covenant 75, &c.

Sacraments. Number.

The way to find out the number of Sacraments. —— 514
No express Scripture to determine their number 515

Two onely standing ordinances in the Old Testament of the nature of Sacraments —— ibid.
Five suppositious Sacraments of Rome *examined* —— 528

Sacrifices.

Whether of the dictates of nature 21
Not Sacraments —— 529
How far Sacramentall —— ibid.
How they differ from Sacraments —— ibid.

Saint.

A title in Scripture not proper in the justified, 149

Sanctification.

The Spirit of God, and not man, is to have the denomination in it 452

Satisfaction

How Christs satisfaction to God for us is received by us —— 457

Sathan

His imitation of God in the wayes of his worship 20

Sea.

Israels passage through it of the nature of a Sacrament 525
No standing Sacrament 526

Seales.

Various acceptation of the word 326
Severall use of a Seal 327
For secrecy ibid.
For warranty ibid.
For distinction ibid.
For security ibid.
For ratification ib. &c.
Seal of the Covenant, and the Seal of the Spirit not of equall latitude —— 141

Seals. Sacraments.

Sacraments are Seales 326
Serving for ratification of promises 328
Objections answered ibid. &c.
The whole use and office of Sacraments is by way of signe and seal 352
Reasons confirming it 354, 355
Humane authorities produced 356
Variety of opinions about the working of Sacraments 359, &c.
Propositions tending to cleer the truth —— 363
Texts of Scripture brought by those that would raise the work of Sacraments higher, of two sorts 372
1. Such where no Sacrament is mentioned ib.
2. Such where faith is required to the attainment of the effect 376
Objections answered —— 380

Sermon

Formally so called not essentiall to a Sacrament. —— 61
Whether the word which gives being to Sacraments be concionatorium, *or* consecratorium 57. &c.

Scripture

Must not be left to hunt after humane authorities 111
Scripture order of words no foundation for arguments 170
Scripture characters of men in grace, are laid down for men to try themselves by 189

Signe

What it is —— 38, &c.
Severall kinds of Signes 39
Naturall ibid.
Prodigious —— 41, &c.
By institution —— 42
Rules for the right understanding of naturall signes 39
Remote causes are no signes ibid.
Partiall causes are no signes 40
Naturall signes when causes work unavoidably —— 41

Sacramentall signes.

Sacraments are signes 38
Sacraments are to be defined as signes —— 321
Objections answered ibid. &c.

Sacramentall signes.

Their properties —— 43
Externall and sensible ibid.
Visible —— 43, 44
Analogicall —— 45
Ritual —— 46
Distinguishing 46, 47, 65, &c.
Congregating 47, 48
Engaging —— ibid.
Remembrancing ibid. 49
Ratifying —— 49
Gods condescension in Sacramentall signes 52, 53
Sacramentall signes must be explained — 56

Sin.

All sins are not Spirit-grieving sins 392
Notable sins in regenerate persons followed with

with many dangers 394
They cloud assurance of glory ibid.
They bring an inaptitude on the soul to enter into glory 395
They bring under wrath and displeasure, though they work not into a state of wrath 396
They are such an obstruction in the way of bliss, that they bring a necessity on the soul to come in by repentance 397
Rules to discern the nature and quality of sins. 399
The more of light, the less of weakness, and the crime more hainous—— ibid.
The less of temptation, the more of sin, and the less of weakness ibid. &c.
The more of deliberation and conviction, the more of sin 400
The more opportunity for duty, the greater the neglect. 401
Severall sorts of sins that are Covenant forfeitures 402, &c.

Sincerity

Of heart in covenanting not of the essence and being of a Covenant 131

Spirit.

The seal of the Covenant, and the seal of the Spirit not of equall latitude—— 141
Blood and Spirit may be distinguished, but must not be divided 367
The acts of the Spirit in a believing soul, are ascribed to faith 463
The Spirit works not in us respective to Salvation, after faith is implanted, without us. ibid.
The Spirit hath a further hand in justification, or pardon of sin then alone by enditing the Gospell 483
Scriptures and humane authorities produced for it ibid.
The Spirit of God and not man is to have the denomination in Sanctification—— 452

Lords Supper

A privilege of the Church visible 187
It is not limited to the actually regenerate. 189, 192
Arguments evincing it ibid. &c.
It must be administred for the communicants edification—— 199
With the word as an appendant to it, it may be serviceable towards conversion 200
Arguments evincing it 200, &c.
Objections answered—— 209, &c.
Generall charges 209. to 216
Particular arguments. 216
Whether the Lords Supper may be stiled a converting ordinance 211
Explicatory propositions ibid. &c.
The Lords Supper supposeth not thorough conversion, and faith justifying 217
Not instituted onely for justified persons 218
All of present incapacity to receive benefit by the Lords Supper, are to be denied access to it. 225
Scandalous persons of a vicious and profligate course of life, are in an incapacity of profit by the Lords Supper—— 238
Arguments evincing it 239
Objections answered 240
Who are to judge of mens present aptitude for the Lords Supper. 249
The judgement of the Church of England formerly concerning it ib.
The judgement of the School-men ibid.
The judgement of the antient Fathes 250
The judgement of a great party of the reformed Churches. ibid.
The Lords supper may be occasionally delayed 299
The argument borrowed from delay of the passeover vindicated ibid.
Just occasions of delay instanced in 302
No prescript for the time, frequency of observation of the Lords Supper 303
Directions for our guidance about it 304
When dispensed it may not without weighty reasons be omitted 306
Excuses for absence from it removed ib.
The excuse of unfitness examined 307
The excuse of the want of a wonted Leiturgy examined 308
The excuse from the variation of a gesture, or posture examined 310
The excuse from a call to give an account of knowledge examined 311
The excuse from mixture of such that are supposed unworthy examined—— ibid.

See Sacraments.

T.

Tree

OF life in Paradise a Sacrament 9.14
Tree of knowledge a Sacrament ibid.
These Trees had somewhat that answered their names—— 12
Not by any naturall power ib.
Reasons and experience making it good 13
Why the Tree of knowledge bears that name 15, 16

Transubstantiation

There is no such thing—— 51

Titles.

A communication of them between Christ, and his Church 448, 449
Titles given by the Apostle to Baptized ones, do not alwayes argue that in their thoughts they were answered by inherent grace 149

Type

Variously used—— 428
Leviticall types lead unto Christ in his Priestly office 566

U.

Visible

BAptisme and the Lords Supper, priviledges of the Church visible 187

Visibility

Of interest the Churches rule in administring Sacraments 118. 187

Extreme Unction.

The Matter.
Form.
Minister.
Effects.
} 534

Qualifications of the subject ib.
Arguments evincing it so be no Sacrament 585

Unfitnes

For the Lords Supper, no excuse for a continued neglect of it 307

Unregenerate

Man may assent to the whole truth—— 198

W.

Doctor Ward.

VIndicated—— 116, 117

Water

In Baptisme implies uncleanes, with a possibility of cleansing not by our own, but by anothers power—— 368
It holds out the Spirit for sanctification ib.
With the bloud for pardon 369

Word.

One and the same word often repeated in the same verse or neer to it, in a different sense 573

Word of God

A necessary meanes of faiths nourishment 509

Works

Paul excludes not onely works of merit, but all works from justification—— 574
He excludes all works that we have done ib.
He excludes all those works, or righteousnes which is inherent ib.
He excludes all those works which the Law commands. 575
He excludes all those works which any in the highest pitch of grace can attain unto. ibid.

FINIS.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

A Table of those Scriptures which are occasionally cleared, briefly illustrated, or largely vindicated in this *Treatise*.

Genesis.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
2	9	10
3	22, 23	13, 14
5	9	598
8	21	363
9	8, &c.	516

Exodus.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
12	25	301
	43, 44, 45	75. 78
	48, 49	75
13	4, 5	399
	21, 22	521
	45	301
14	19, 20	521
	21, 22	523
16	14, 15	*ibid.*
17	6	524

Numbers.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
9	1.	300
	15	521
11	7	523
14	14	521
20	9	524
21	17, 18	525

Deuteronomie.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
8	3	523
10	16	380
12	5, 6, 7	300
	10, 11	301
16	*usque ad* 8	299, 300
30	6	376. 379

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
4	25	523

2 Chronicles.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
16	8, 9 ——	638
34	3	301
	3, 4	*ibid.*
35	19 ——	*ibid.*

Ezra.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
6	19	301

Nehemiah.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
9	19	521
	20	523
	25	524

Psalms.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
32	7, 8	352
37	25, 26	30
51	5	363
	7	373
54	3	363
78	13	523
	15	524
	23	*ib.*
	24	523
98	14	521
105	41	524
112	2, 3	30
114	7, 8	524

Jeremiah.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
9	25	379
10	25	299
11	3, 4	281
23	6	449
31	32, 33	84, 85
33	16	449

Ezekiel.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
12	10	204

Matthew.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
5	48	645
6	30	590
7	6	230
9	22	486
11	28	460
13	11, 12	54
	39, 40, 49	269
15	26	260
20	29	166
24	32 269.	295

Mark.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
4	33	54
5	34	486
6	13	534
10	14	227
16	16	170

Luke.

Chap.	Verse.	Pag.
1	6	598
	75	596
7	39	486
14	15	219
15	33	188

15	22	225
17	6	590

John.

Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
1	4	645
2	23	220
3	5	290
	5, 8, 10, 12.	53, 54
6	53	227
	53, 54	373
	31, 49, 58	523
8	31	188
12	42	177

Acts.

Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
2	38	367
	37, 38	108
	39	174
	41	217
	47	299
8	13	160
	17	530
	37	176
10	47	163, 217
15	9	449, 450
22	16	376. 380

Romanes.

Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
2	28	128
3	25	432. 567
	28	587
	30	451
4	1. *uſque ad* 12	352
	3	177
	11	334 35
	17	218
5	9	587
	8, 9	567
	19	365
9	4	151
7	22	594

1 Corinthians.

Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
4	4	431. 575
5	11	261
6	12	372
7	14	150. 176
10	1, 2, 3	424
	1, 2	525
	4	524
	5, 6, 7, 11	428
	16, 17, &c.	48
	17	358
11	28	227
12	12	419
	13	358
14	14, 15, 16, &c.	199
15	34	100
	56	604

2 Corinthians.

Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
1	12	431
	21	67
7	1	452
13	5	492
	11	645

Galatians.

Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
2	19	599
3	14	444
	18	451

Epheſians.

Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
2	12	299
3	17	444. 448
4	24	592
5	26	372
	32. 2. 541, &c.	

1 Theſſalonians.

Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
5	23	586

2 Theſſalonians.

Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
3	14	261

Titus.

chap.	verſ.	pag.
3	5	374. 380

Hebrews.

chap.	verſ.	pag.
4	2	471. 481
8	7	364
9	26	269
11	29	523
11	throughout.	569

James.

chap.	verſ.	pag.
2	25	572. 577
5	14, 15	535, 536

1 Peter.

chap.	verſ.	pag.
1	4	17
	22	452
3	20, 21	353. 387
	21	170

1 John.

chap.	verſ.	pag.
4	7	596

Revelation.

chap.	verſ.	pag.
22	2	10
	11	592
2	7	10

FINIS.